FIFTY-THIRD

ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, COLUMBUS.

American Institute of Instruction.

LECTURES, DISCUSSIONS, AND PROCEEDINGS.

SARATOGA, N. Y., JULY 11–14, 1882.

Published by order of the Board of Directors.

BOSTON, MASS.:
AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION.
1882.

LZ 13
A51
1882

PREFACE.

THE *fifty-third* consecutive annual meeting of THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION was held at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., July 11–14, 1882, in connection with the twenty-first annual meeting of THE NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION. The meetings of the INSTITUTE were on Tuesday and Thursday, the 11th and 13th, and those of the ASSOCIATION were on Wednesday and Friday, the 12th and 14th. On Friday evening a joint meeting of both bodies was held, at which short addresses were made by representative men from various states, East, West, and South.

All railroad tickets from New England required the stamp of the secretary of the INSTITUTE, which was obtainable after the payment of one dollar (the annual membership fee) to the treasurer; without this stamp the return ticket was not good. All railroad arrangements from points outside of New England were made by the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION.

Reduced rates for board at the various hotels were offered to members of either association. All arrangements were made by the officers of the two bodies with cordial good-will and remarkable harmony. The meetings were unusually large, the papers were of a very high order, and the discussions were sustained with remarkable interest. Probably no educational meeting ever before held in the country brought together so large a number of distinguished educators, and perhaps never before were read at one meeting so many papers of a high order of excellence, discussing the prominent educational topics of the day with great vigor and ability. The discussions following Mr. Dickinson's paper on "Oral Teaching," and Mr. Clark's paper on "Industrial Education," are reported in full, and will be found following the papers, in this volume. The proceedings, all discussions, and all

50825

extemporaneous addresses and lectures were stenographically reported for the INSTITUTE by Mr. Edwin R. Gardner, of Providence, R. I., who performed this labor with great skill and to the entire satisfaction of the officers of the INSTITUTE.

In connection with this meeting was the first full session for the reading and discussion of papers, by the NATIONAL COUNCIL OF EDUCATION. The meeting of this body will long be remembered as of unusual interest and great value to all who participated in it. The papers read have been published under the direction of the president of the COUNCIL, Thomas W. Bicknell, LL. D., of Boston, and will be found of great value.

The papers, discussions, and proceedings of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION will soon be published by that body, under the direction of its secretary, Mr. William E. Sheldon, of Boston.

Altogether the meetings were very satisfactory, and will undoubtedly prove eminently useful. Among other advantages may be mentioned the cordial good-will that was manifested, fostered and strengthened between educators from the various sections of our country. It was estimated that representatives were present from thirty states, besides some distinguished persons from various parts of the Dominion of Canada. The undersigned were appointed by the directors, a "Committee on Printing," and the present volume has been prepared and printed under their direction and supervision. It was also voted by the directors that all members of the INSTITUTE, who should pay to the treasurer *ten cents* for postage, should receive this volume in paper cover, and those who should pay *fifty cents*, to cover extra cost of binding, postage, and mailing, should receive a copy in cloth binding.

GEORGE A. WALTON,
JAMES W. WEBSTER,
R. C. METCALF,
WILLIAM A. MOWRY,
} *Committee on Printing.*

BOSTON, NOV. 1, 1882.

3330

CONTENTS.

PREFACE, ... 3
OFFICERS, ... 6

JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS.

FIRST DAY, ... 9
SECOND DAY, ... 17
THIRD DAY, ... 24

LECTURES.

I. WHAT SCHOOLS WILL DO FOR A PEOPLE.
By the President, William A. Mowry, PH. D. . 37

II. LIMITS OF ORAL TEACHING.
By Hon. J. W. Dickinson, A. M. . . . 54

III. SOME ASPECTS OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION OF WOMEN.
By John Tetlow, A. M. 95

IV. MORAL TEACHING IN THE SCHOOLS.
By Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer. . . . 125

V. TEMPERANCE FOR THE YOUNG.
By John B. Gough, Esq. 133

VI. REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION. . 165
INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION A NECESSARY PART OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.
By John S. Clark, Esq. 167

VII. THE EDUCATION OF THE WILL.
By Prof. G. Stanley Hall, PH. D. . . . 236

VIII. AN ABSTRACT FROM A PAPER ON THE OUTLINES OF A PHILOSOPHY OF DELIVERY.
By Prof. J. W. Churchill, A. M. . . . 272

IX. WHAT PLACE, IF ANY, IS RELIGION ENTITLED TO IN OUR SYSTEM OF PUBLIC EDUCATION?
By A. J. F. Behrends, D. D. 286

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON NECROLOGY. . . 315

OFFICERS

OF

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION.

1830-1882.

Presidents.

1830–1832.	Francis Wayland	Providence, R. I.
1833–1839.	William B. Calhoun	Springfield, Mass.
1840.	James G. Carter	Lancaster, Mass.
1841–1848.	George B. Emerson	Boston, Mass.
1849–1852.	Gideon F. Thayer	Boston, Mass.
1853–1854.	Thomas Sherwin	Boston, Mass.
1855–1856.	John Kingsbury	Providence, R. I.
1857–1858.	John D. Philbrick	Boston, Mass.
1859–1860.	Daniel B. Hagar	Jamaica Plain, Mass.
1861–1862.	Admiral P. Stone	Plymouth, Mass.
1863.	Charles Northend	New Britain, Conn.
1864–1865.	Birdsey G. Northrop	Saxonville, Mass.
1866.	William E. Sheldon	Boston, Mass.
1867–1868.	John Kneeland	Roxbury, Mass.
1869.	Samuel S. Greene	Providence, R. I.
1870–1871.	Abner J. Phipps	Medford, Mass.
1872–1873.	M. C. Stebbins	Springfield, Mass.
1874–1875.	Merrick Lyon	Providence, R. I.
1876–1877.	Thomas W. Bicknell	Boston, Mass.
1878–1879.	Isaac N. Carleton	New Britain, Conn.
1880–1881.	William A. Mowry	Providence, R. I.
1882.	George A. Walton	West Newton, Mass.

Secretaries.

1830–1831.	Gideon F. Thayer	Boston, Mass.
1832.	Peter Macintosh	Boston, Mass.
1833–1834.	Alfred W. Pike	Boston, Mass.
1835.	Aaron B. Hoyt	Boston, Mass.
1836–1842.	Thomas Cushing, Jr.	Boston, Mass.
1843.	Solomon Adams	Boston, Mass.
1844.	Samuel S. Greene	Boston, Mass.
1845.	William A. Shepard	Boston, Mass.
1846–1848.	John D. Philbrick	Boston, Mass.
1849.	Charles Northend	Salem, Mass.
1850–1851.	Jacob Batchelder, Jr	Lynn, Mass.
1852.	Charles E. Valentine	Boston, Mass.
1853–1855.	Daniel B. Hagar	West Roxbury, Mass.
1856–1857.	John Kneeland	Roxbury, Mass.
1858–1859.	Benjamin W. Putnam	Boston, Mass.
1860–1861.	William E. Sheldon	West Newton, Mass.
1862–1863.	Samuel W. Mason	Boston, Mass.
1864–1865.	John P. Averill	Boston, Mass.
1866.	Charles A. Morrell	Boston, Mass.
1867.	George T. Littlefield.	Somerville, Mass.
1868–1871.	Daniel W. Jones	Boston, Mass.
1872–1873.	William E. Eaton	Boston, Mass.
1874–1875.	James W. Webster	Boston, Mass.
1876–1877.	J. Milton Hall	Providence, R. I.
1878–1879.	Henry E. Sawyer	New Britain, Conn.
1880–1881.	George A. Littlefield.	Boston, Mass.
1882.	Robert C. Metcalf	Boston, Mass.

Assistant Secretaries.

1866.	George T. Littlefield.	Somerville, Mass.
1867–1870.	Charles O. Thompson	Arlington, Mass.
1871–1872.	Alfred Bunker	Boston, Mass.
1873.	James W. Webster	Boston, Mass.
1874.	Gilbert E. Whittemore.	Providence, R. I.
1875.	J. Milton Hall	Providence, R. I.
1876–1879.	George A. Littlefield.	Malden, Mass.

1880–1881.	AUGUSTUS D. SMALL	Salem, Mass.
1882.	GEORGE E. CHURCH	Providence, R. I.

Treasurers.

1830–1831.	BENJAMIN D. EMERSON	Boston, Mass.
1832–1835.	RICHARD B. CARTER	Boston, Mass.
1836–1863.	WILLIAM D. TICKNOR	Boston, Mass.
1864–1865.	WILLIAM E. SHELDON	Boston, Mass.
1866.	GRANVILLE B. PUTNAM	Boston, Mass.
1867–1881.	GEORGE A. WALTON	Lawrence, Mass.
1882.	JAMES W. WEBSTER	Malden, Mass.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION.

FIFTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING,

JULY 11TH TO THE 14TH, 1882.

JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS.

THE FIFTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION began its sessions in the Methodist Episcopal Church at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., on Tuesday morning, July 11, 1882. The president, William A. Mowry, PH. D., of Providence, R. I., called to order at 9.40 o'clock, and the Rev. George W. Brown, pastor of the church in which the exercises were held, read selections of Scripture and offered prayer.

Robert F. Milligan, Esq., president of the Village of Saratoga, made the following address of welcome:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE CONVENTION: It is with pleasure that I, in behalf of the people of Saratoga Springs, extend to you the courtesies of our village, and bid you welcome. Taking into consideration the nature and character of your assembly, I consider that it is eminently proper that all farther words of welcome should be addressed to you by the president of our Board of Education, whom I now take pleasure in introducing to you.

Remarks of Hon. John Foley.

Mr. President: It is with great diffidence that I respond to your request to address a few words of welcome to these distinguished bodies of assembled educators. I recognize the honor, and the duty, as both belonging to you. I undertake the one and accept the other, not as my own, but at your command. I also, sir, recognize another honor,—one in which you share, and one in which every citizen of our village shares alike, viz.: that of the union in time and place of these two organizations, so widely known, so widely honored, and so deeply and widely influential in the work of educating the youth of our land. It is a peculiar honor that the American Institute of Instruction, which has chosen its place of meeting so very few times outside of New England,—the place of its birth and vigorous activity for more than half a century,—should select our home as the place of *two* of those meetings. It is a rare honor, too, that the National Teachers' Association should select this same time and place in which to celebrate its majority, or twenty-first anniversary. I know, sir, that you will join with me in the earnest wish that the promise of its youth may more than blossom, as it passes on into its years of manhood.

But I had almost forgotten that I bear a message to the guests here before us. Officers and members of the American Institute and National Educational Association: While we desire to extend to you our kindest greetings, we would not be true to the interests with which we are all so intimately associated if we omitted the expression of a few thoughts which now weigh upon us. The Honorable George William Curtis, in a late oration, which some of you heard, not only asserts that educated men are the leaders in history, but virtually declares that they are the makers of history. He sustains his assertions by a long list of names honored in history, from Roger Williams to those concerned in the making and adopting of our glorious national Constitution. If, then, the educated men are the leaders, do not those who educate hold, and have they not always held, the destinies of our country in their hands? Doubtless you, as educators,

and yet more as leaders of educators, will in these important deliberations weigh well the mighty possibilities and great issues bound up in your work. Permit me to suggest, as worthy of a place in your discussions, the question, "What are educators to do with and for the incessant stream of immigration flowing into this country, largely illiterate and superstitious, and wholly ignorant of the nature of our institutions?" Are the means in your hands adequate to the great want: and can you take the boy born in a foreign land, or of foreign parentage, and educate him to be the leader described by Mr. Curtis? If so, our land will long continue to be "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Ladies and gentlemen, representing nearly every state in the Union, I bid you welcome, in the name of our citizens,—welcome to our hearts, our homes, our village; its walks, its drives, and all that is pleasant and agreeable within it and about us. We add the wish that the draughts from the healing fountains placed here by the bountiful Giver, may unite with the feasts of reason to be served in this room, to inspire and strengthen you. Enjoy it all, and use it all, and push bravely on in the great work committed to your hands.

The president of the Institute then made the following response:

Response of President Mowry.

Mr. President of the Village, and Mr. President of the Board of Education of Saratoga: On behalf of this convention, representing these two great bodies, and more especially in my own capacity as representative of the American Institute of Instruction, I thank you for these kind words of welcome. It is very gratifying to us to have the opportunity to come here to this beautiful town to hold our convention in so pleasant a place, with such great advantages, with such excellent opportunities, with such wonderful care over us. It is a great privilege for us to come to a place where the people are so accustomed to entertain strangers, and entertain them in such an excellent and elegant manner.

I shall have but few words to say at this time. The arrangements are such for this joint convention that the spe-

cial programme for to-day has been made by the American Institute of Instruction, and for to-morrow by the National Educational Association. I take pleasure in presenting to you the president of the National Educational Association, Dr. Gustavus J. Orr, the Superintendent of Public Schools of the State of Georgia.

Address of President Orr.

Mr. President of the Village, and Mr. President of the Board of Education of Saratoga: We have felt, gentlemen, ever since our arrival, that we were welcome. We have seen words of welcome written on every face, beaming from every countenance. Even inanimate things have bid us welcome,—your elegant homes, beautifully embowered amid the trees, your beautiful parks, your health-giving waters, your home-like hotels,—all these things have said to us from the beginning that we were heartily welcome. It was fitting, however, sir, that you should have expressed this welcome in words, and it is proper that we should reply. The gentleman appointed to represent the National Educational Association in replying to these words of welcome is absent to-day, but I have the pleasure of presenting a substitute for myself. This duty would have fallen upon me, but I have put it upon one who can discharge it much more satisfactorily: I have the pleasure of presenting to you Dr. J. H. Carlisle, of South Carolina.

Address of Dr. Carlisle.

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen: We, the teachers of many cities and states of the Union, thankfully accept these courtesies, in the simplicity and hearty sincerity in which they have been offered. It is really an era in the history of these two bodies when they get together thus for the first time; and, perhaps there was a propriety, of which Dr. Orr little thought, in calling a teacher from South Carolina to discharge this duty; for, when a young teacher, struggling with all the disadvantages of ignorance, and the painful limitations of inexperience, I sent afar off to New Eng-

land to get all the volumes they had printed of addresses before the American Institute. They are still valuable works in my library. They have made me somewhat familiar with some of the men whom I hope to greet personally to-day. It is an era in the life of every individual teacher who is to be here. Our profession, friends, let us confess before the public to-day, is not usually a social one. Indeed, you might almost say, that teachers, like other carnivorous, flesh-bruising animals, generally go alone; occasionally in pairs you may see them, but hardly ever are they gregarious. But within the last few years they have found the strength that lies in communion — in looking into a human eye, grasping a human hand. We have come here to study life, human nature, each other, and the duties of the school-room. Dr. Orr will excuse me if I state that some time ago, a man living in the northern part of his native State of Georgia, a farmer, whose life had been somewhat circumscribed, concluded he would go to Atlanta for a market, instead of into the neighboring market town. He went; he came back, and was the oracle of the neighborhood for a while, and to one who consulted him about the matter he said: "Friend, I tell you if this world stretches as far to the north as it does down towards Atlanta, where I have been, it is a bigger world than I thought it was." Friends, I think it likely that the world in which you and I have to do our part is much larger than you and I, who have been teaching geography all our lives, have ever conceived. It is well to learn, as I have learned, that a mere dot on the map represents a town, and that a crooked line that you taught your boys and girls to draw and call a river *is* a river. If there is any man of you, in middle life, who has never been South or West, I heartily sympathize with you because of your sadly neglected education; I am in a condition to do it, for hardly forty-eight hours have passed since, for the first time in my life, my foot pressed the soil of the Middle States of this Union, as we were taught to call them,— New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. Fix your eyes upon a map, and see where is the middle point. It is a movable point; and if our growing aspirations are developed much farther — and I don't know where I would stop them — we

would reach that famous definition of a circle,—our country will be "a circle whose middle point is everywhere and its circumference nowhere." I have no objection to the middle point being everywhere, and every teacher thinking his school-room the middle point of the universe. John Wesley said: "The world is my parish." I have seen, and so have you, a very neat retort to that proverb, that the young minister should say: "My parish is my world." So should you say: "My school-room is my world." I said just now that it was well to learn that a crooked line on the map represents a river, and I suppose I have taught many boys to draw a crooked line, running vaguely south towards New York, as representing the Hudson River. I confess that twenty-four hours ago, I found the Hudson River for the first time, when on my journey to this place. I found at every turn of it some magnificent picture that I could take away with me as a perpetual possession,

"Touched by a light that hath no name,
A glory never sung,
A light on sky and mountain walls,
Where God's great pictures hung."

There was a little quiet nook above Crugor's Island, and there, out of that floating palace, on the Hudson, I could see the railroad trains dashing by, and I thought of the time when in my own little state the first car was propelled by a locomotive, to carry a United States mail,—for you must let me claim for my native state that first glory,— South Carolina was the first state in which a mail was ever carried by a steam-engine. But all these things only show the teacher what a world it is we live in, and what a world we are to introduce our pupils into. Mr. Richardson, the great English preacher, said, when he went to the Crystal Palace in New York, "For a while, when I walked up and down these halls and saw the magnificent products of the human hand, I almost envied the lot of the artisan and the mechanic; but in a moment I reasserted my dignity, when I said 'I don't deal with matter, but with human hearts, minds and souls'; and I came away thankful that I was a preacher." *I* could almost envy the builders of steamboats, and of these princely

storehouses, and of the splendid locomotive that, like a thing of life, heaves and pants, and has brought all of us in safety here. But let us not do it. You and I deal with those who, in other days, are to make those engines, and those who are to guide them. And I trust that lesson will be deeply impressed upon us, that we are to do our part in preparing our pupils to build up this country, in which we all are brethren.

One of the great poets says:

> "How pleasant 'tis to grasp the hand
> Of brother in a foreign land."

That pleasure has never been mine. I have never been in a foreign land. But I think that still more pleasant is the grasp of the hand of a brother in one's native land.

In conclusion, I am sure I but express the sentiments of the teachers before me,—who, though strangers to me personally, are all here together in one great and common cause,—when I return their thanks to those gentlemen who with such earnest, hearty, simple, and sincere words have extended these courtesies, which we gratefully accept; and in your behalf I venture to invoke upon Saratoga, and on its interests, the blessings of Heaven,—upon its citizens, its thousands of tired guests, who come here for rest, and its thousands of invalids, who come here for health. As the rain that came down last night to cool your heated sod, reappears in this spring or that, so may we drink in deep influences here, which we shall render back again with individual tinge of color, wherever we may be, and go forth to do our life-work still more earnestly. At the close of the sessions of a body somewhat like this, but much smaller (and I beg to express the hope that the practical working of the two bodies will be as fruitful in actual results as their union on this occasion is friendly and harmonious), in a body much smaller than this, a gentleman who had come to conduct it said, speaking to some friends: "My life has been enriched by the experience of the past few days." I venture to adopt that as my closing wish, on the part of the sessions of these bodies, that your experience and mine may be that our lives have been enriched; that

"Touched by a light that hath no name,"

your school-room, and mine, friends, sometimes repulsive, it may be, will brighten and radiate hereafter with a light that it hath not known; that it may be, for you and me, a most satisfying, lovely, even sacred place, and that you and I, when we meet hereafter, in the chances of this traveling age, may grasp a friendly hand with a little more than usual devotion when we say: "Have not our lives been enriched ever since we spent a few days together, as fellow-students, at Saratoga, in 1882?"

General business being next in order, the following committees were announced by the president:

Committee on Nominations—S. S. Greene, of Rhode Island; C. C. Rounds, of Maine; E. R. Ruggles, of New Hampshire; Justus Dartt, of Vermont; A. P. Stone, of Massachusetts; A. G. Boyden, of Massachusetts; and D. N. Camp, of Connecticut.

Committee on Resolutions—M. H. Buckham, of Vermont; M. C. Fernald, of Maine; C. P. Hall, of New Hampshire; T. W. Bicknell, of Massachusetts; Larkin Dunton, of Massachusetts; Geo. E. Church, of Rhode Island; and F. F. Barrows, of Connecticut.

Committee on Teachers and Teachers' Places—J. W. Patterson, of New Hampshire; W. E. Sheldon, of Massachusetts; T. B. Stockwell, of Rhode Island; and R. S. Cummings, of Massachusetts.

Committee on Necrology—C. Northend, of Connecticut; Judah Dana, of Vermont; Elbridge Smith, of Massachusetts; and Merrick Lyon, of Rhode Island.

The president, William A. Mowry, PH. D., then read his annual address. (See lectures.)

Hon. John W. Dickinson, secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, then read a paper on "The Limits of Oral Instruction." (See lectures.)

Recess till 2.30 P. M.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Institute resumed its session at the hour appointed.

The treasurer of the Institute, George A. Walton, Esq., of

West Newton, Mass., presented his annual report, which was referred to the Auditing Committee, who subsequently reported that they had examined the same and found it correct.

A paper was then read by John Tetlow, A. M., Head Master of the Girls' Latin School, Boston, Mass., upon this subject: "Some Aspects of the Higher Education of Women." (See lectures.)

A paper was then read by Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer, of Florence, Mass., upon "Moral Teaching in the Public Schools." (See lectures for abstract of this paper.)

The concluding exercise of the afternoon consisted of readings by Prof. J. W. Churchill, of Andover Theological Seminary. The selections were Bret Harte's "Santa Claus at Simpson's Bar," and Charles Lever's "Father Philip Blake's Subscription List."

Adjourned till 8 o'clock, P. M.

TUESDAY EVENING, JULY 11TH.

A very large audience assembled in the evening and were entertained by the readings of Professor Churchill, of Andover Theological Seminary; after which John B. Gough, Esq., of Worcester, Mass., was introduced, and delivered a lecture on "Temperance for the Young." (See lectures.)

At the conclusion of Mr. Gough's lecture, the Institute adjourned to Thursday morning, at 9.30 o'clock.

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION.

The Institute reassembled on Thursday morning, at 9.30 o'clock.

The opening religious exercises were conducted by the Rev. A. J. F. Behrends, D. D., of Providence, R. I.

Professor C. Northend, of Connecticut, presented the annual report of the Committee on Necrology, which was accepted and ordered to be printed in the volume of the proceedings.

The president renominated the same gentlemen as last year to constitute again the Committee on Necrology for the ensuing year, and they were elected, as follows: Charles

Northend, Connecticut; Judah Dana, Vermont; Elbridge Smith, Massachusetts; Merrick Lyon, Rhode Island.

Mr. Boyden, of Massachusetts, presented the report of the committee appointed to nominate a list of officers for the Institute for the ensuing year. The report was accepted and the Institute voted to proceed to the election of officers. A ballot was taken, resulting in the unanimous election of all the nominees reported by the committee, as follows:

OFFICERS OF AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION, 1882–1883.

President — George A. Walton, Massachusetts.

Vice-Presidents — Henry Barnard, Connecticut; Henry K. Oliver, Massachusetts; Samuel S. Greene, Rhode Island; Ariel Parish, Connecticut; John D. Philbrick, Massachusetts; Hiram Orcutt, Massachusetts; Charles Northend, Connecticut; Merrick Lyon, Rhode Island; Thomas W. Bicknell, Massachusetts; C. C. Rounds, Maine; A. P. Stone, Massachusetts; John Eaton, District Columbia; B. G. Northrop, Connecticut; T. B. Stockwell, Rhode Island; D. N. Camp, Connecticut; J. W. Dickinson, Massachusetts; D. W. Jones, Massachusetts; D. B. Hagar, Massachusetts; Daniel Leach, Rhode Island; Albert G. Boyden, Massachusetts; E. A. Hubbard, Massachusetts; J. H. Hanson, Maine; M. H. Buckham, Vermont; G. J. Cummings, Massachusetts; J. L. Curry, Virginia; A. D. Mayo, Massachusetts; Edward Conant, Vermont; Sarah E. Doyle, Rhode Island; Celeste E. Bush, Connecticut; W. J. Corthell, Maine; Augustus Morse, Connecticut; Albert Harkness, Rhode Island; Charles P. Rugg, Massachusetts; W. E. Eaton, Massachusetts; H. T. Fuller, Vermont; Edwin P. Seaver, Massachusetts; D. W. Hoyt, Rhode Island; William T. Harris, Massachusetts; Justin Dartt, Vermont; Henry C. Harden, Massachusetts; Homer B. Sprague, Massachusetts; R. Woodbury, Maine; F. F. Barrows, Connecticut; L. W. Russell, Rhode Island; S. W. Mason, Massachusetts; F. D. Blakeslee, Rhode Island; Ellen Hyde, Massachusetts: Judah Dana, Vermont; J. G. Scott, Massachusetts; A. W. Edson, Vermont; H. P. War-

ren, New Hampshire; Elbridge Smith, Massachusetts; E. S. Ball, Rhode Island; J. D. Bartley, Connecticut; H. M. Harrington, Connecticut; J. F. Blackinton, Massachusetts; H. E. Sawyer, Connecticut; J. W. Patterson, New Hampshire; George T. Littlefield, Massachusetts; I. N. Carlton, Connecticut; Larkin Dunton, Massachusetts; George A. Littlefield, Massachusetts.

Secretary — Robert C. Metcalf, Massachusetts.

Assistant Secretary — George E. Church, Rhode Island.

Treasurer — James W. Webster, Massachusetts.

Assistant Treasurer — J. Milton Hall, Rhode Island; (Added subsequently.)

Councillors — William A. Mowry, Rhode Island; B. F. Tweed, Massachusetts; M. G. Daniels, Massachusetts; John Kneeland, Massachusetts; A. J. Manchester, Rhode Island; A. P. Marble, Massachusetts; J. Milton Hall, Rhode Island; J. S. Barrell, Massachusetts; J. C. Greenough, Rhode Island; E. R. Ruggles, New Hampshire; W. N. Lambert, Massachusetts; Frank A. Hill, Massachusetts.

Mr. Stone, of Massachusetts, called attention to the need of an assistant treasurer, and asked if there would be any impropriety in authorizing the treasurer to appoint such an officer.

The president said that such officer could not be a member of the Board of Directors until the constitution was amended so as to make this one of the regular officers.

At the request of Mr. Stone, the president appointed a meeting of the Board of Directors, to be held at the close of the morning session, for the purpose of considering the subject of amending the constitution in the foregoing particular.

The president read letters from Dr. John D. Philbrick, of Massachusetts, and President James B. Angell, of the University of Michigan, announcing inability to be present.

On motion of Dr. John Hancock, the resolution adopted by the National Educational Association yesterday, asking Congress to make appropriations for the support of schools upon the basis of illiteracy, was referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

The president announced that, owing to the absence of President Angell on account of sickness, the place assigned for his lecture this evening would be filled by the Rev. Dr. Behrends' paper, and that Dr. Dunton's paper would be read this afternoon in the place prescribed in the programme for Dr. Behrends' paper.

Industrial Education.

The report of the Committee on Industrial Education was presented by the secretary of the committee, Mr. John S. Clark, of Boston, who read first the report of the committee, and then the argument which he had been requested by the committee to prepare. (See lectures.)

Adjourned till 2.30, P. M.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION.

On motion of Mr. Sheldon, the report of the Committee on Industrial Education was accepted, with a recommendation that the Board of Directors appoint a new committee for next year.

Mr. Daniel, in behalf of the Board of Directors, reported that, by a two-thirds vote, said Board recommended that Article IV. of the Constitution be amended by inserting, after the word "Treasurer," the words "an Assistant Treasurer," the purpose of the amendment being to create the office of assistant treasurer of the Institute.

The proposed amendment was unanimously adopted.

Mr. J. Milton Hall, of Providence, R. I., in accordance with the nomination of the committee, was duly elected to the office of assistant treasurer.

The retiring secretary of the Institute was made one of the vice-presidents, by a unanimous vote.

The Institute then listened to a paper on "The Education of the Will," by Prof. G. Stanley Hall, PH. D., of Harvard University. (See lectures.)

Dr. Thomas W. Bicknell then reported the prizes awarded from the fund of this Association, for the best essays on the

two subjects announced some six months previous, viz.: "Illiteracy in a Republic," and "The True Order of Instruction in Primary Schools." The report was accepted.

President M. B. Buckham, of the University of Vermont, presented the report of the Committee on Resolutions. The following series of resolutions reported by the committee were adopted:

Resolved, That the following communication, signed by the chairman of the two associations, be sent to the president of the Senate, to the speaker of the House, and to the chairmen of the Committee on Appropriations of the two houses:

The National Educational Association, and the American Institute of Instruction, now in joint session at Saratoga, strongly commend to the care of Congress the Bureau of Education, and respectfully urge the importance of an appropriation not less in amount than that last granted.

Resolved, That in the opinion of this Association it is the duty of Congress to make a liberal appropriation for the support of schools, upon the basis of illiteracy.

Resolved, That inasmuch as the proper training of the young comprehends a knowledge of the true principles of action as well as correct modes of thought, it follows that the educational work should include those studies which help to develop a true manhood, and to protect the child from the evils which false and sinful theories and practices of life foster and confirm.

It is, therefore, the duty of the school to inculcate temperance in all things, and especially abstinence from the use of all meats, drinks and narcotics which tend to undermine health, to degrade the intellectual powers, to lower the moral tone, to destroy the power and capacity of the child both for enjoyment and improvement, and to unfit him for the duties and privileges of a true life.

Resolved, That we are deeply indebted to all persons who have presented papers or given addresses, for their inspiring words of wisdom which have cheered our hearts and will, we trust, shape and guide our future work.

Resolved, That the unfeigned gratitude and hearty thanks of the Institute are due, and are hereby tendered to the officers and employés of the various railroad and steamboat companies, for their coöperation in providing for our prompt, safe and cheap transportation; to the citizens of Saratoga, for their cordial welcome and generous hospitality; to the many hotels and boarding-houses, which have furnished so ample and comfortable provision for our wants; to the Methodist Episcopal Society and the proprietors of Congress

Hall, for the use of their convenient and commodious houses in which to hold the assembly, business and committee sessions; to Robert F. Milligan, president of the Village of Saratoga Springs; and John Foley, president of the Board of Education of Saratoga Springs, for the reception so courteously tendered to the officers of the Institute and the Committee of Arrangements, and especially to President William A. Mowry, for his unwearied labor in planning and conducting this unusually large, interesting and profitable meeting; to the newspapers and their representatives, for careful and complete accounts of the proceedings from day to day; to the local Committee of Arrangements, Levi S. Packard, chairman, and to all others whose executive ability and indefatigable zeal have in any way assisted in arranging and carrying out the innumerable details of this most successful meeting.

Resolved, That while we leave it to individuals to make their own selection from the several valuable educational publications now issued, we strongly advise all teachers to take and diligently read some educational journal, as an indispensable part of the equipment of a teacher for the proper discharge of the office of teaching at the present day.

The Rev. J. W. Churchill, A. M., Professor of Elocution in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass., then read a paper upon the subject of "Elocution." (See lectures.)

Prof. Larkin Dunton, LL. D., Head Master of the Normal School, Boston, Mass., then read a paper on the subject of "Oral Instruction," which will be published by the National Educational Association.

Adjourned till 8 o'clock, P. M.

THURSDAY EVENING SESSION.

A very large audience assembled in the evening, and were entertained by the readings of Professor Churchill. The selections were from "Nicholas Nickleby," and from Eggleston's "Hoosier Schoolmaster."

A lecture was then read by the Rev. A. J. F. Behrends, D. D., of Providence, R. I., upon the following subject: "What Place, if any, is Religion entitled to, in our System of Public Education?" (See lectures.)

At the close of Dr. Behrends' lecture, President Buckham, from the Committee on Resolutions, spoke as follows:

PRESIDENT BUCKHAM, OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

The subject of "Moral Education" has had such prominence in this Association — as it has always had in the public mind — that the Committee on Resolutions have deemed it their duty to formulate what they supposed to be the convictions of the Association on that subject. They have accordingly prepared, with considerable care, a resolution, which, while it respects the sensibility of those who would dread the introduction of any principle which should admit anything like denominationalism or sectarianism, would at the same time make a place for the religious spirit, in so far as it has a due place in the public schools, and especially for that clear and definite code of morality which we know as "Christian Morality."

Resolved, That in view of the paramount importance of private and public morality, and of the danger to which it is exposed by influences proceeding at once from high culture and from gross ignorance, we most earnestly enjoin upon teachers of all grades, and especially upon primary teachers, the duty of using every opportunity to instruct their pupils in those universally recognized principles and those positive precepts of christian morality, on which, as its only sure foundation, all virtue, both individual and social, ultimately rests.

The resolution was read and adopted.

Prof. George E. Church, of Providence, R. I., from the Committee on Resolutions, reported resolutions of thanks, which were adopted. (See pages 21–22.)

The newly-elected president of the Institute, George A. Walton, Esq., of West Newton, Mass., was inducted into the office by the retiring president, Dr. William A. Mowry, who made the following address:

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT MOWRY.

MY BROTHER: For many years you and I have worked side by side in this harness. We have seen large and excellent meetings; and we have seen here, in some respects a larger, pleasanter, and more excellent meeting than ever before. I have a great charge to intrust to you, and this gavel which I

now present to you is the symbol of it. At the close of the first half-century of the existence of this Association, it was the gift of an unknown friend. I received it with a solemn charge to transmit it to my successor, to be by him transmitted to his successor, and so on through the next half-century. May you have a pleasant and successful administration, my brother. I welcome you to this office, and leave this Association in your hands.

Response of President Walton.

Mr. President, and Friends: I am not unmindful of the great compliment paid me, and of the honor which has been bestowed upon me in electing me to this position. If I consulted my own ease, I should certainly accept the honor and refuse the office. But I have not, sir, as you know, been educated in that school which refuses service, and I shall enter, with such ability as I have, upon the duties with which you have intrusted me. I have very great satisfaction in feeling that I am at once assured of the hearty coöperation, in the work upon which I enter, of every member of this body; and I bespeak your kindly consideration and charity for all my efforts and all my failures, and, having said this, I will detain you by no farther remarks on the present occasion.

Notice was given of a meeting of the new Board of Directors at the close of the evening's exercises.

Adjourned to Friday.

FRIDAY EVENING SESSION.

Joint meeting of the American Institute and the National Educational Association.

A large audience was present at the meeting held this evening, and the church was crowded. President Orr, of the National Association, and President Mowry, of the Institute, jointly presided.

President Mowry read the following telegraphic dispatch:

"SACRAMENTO, CAL., July 14, 1882.

To the Presiding Officer of the Educational Convention:

California to-night gives you hearty greeting, fraternal salutations, encouragement, and good cheer. We know that not in our marvelous wealth of soil, of climate, and of scenery, of orchard, vineyard, and grain-field, of mines of gold and silver, nor in the brightness of our skies, but in the wide, open daylight of universal intelligence, lies our hope of permanent prosperity — indeed our safety as a self-governing people — and we are acting on our faith. Remember California to-night.

FRED. M. KIMBALL,

Superintendent Public Instruction, California."

The programme for the evening comprised short extemporaneous addresses from distinguished gentlemen from different parts of the Union.

The first speaker called upon was ex-United States Senator J. W. Patterson, now Superintendent of Schools for the State of New Hampshire. He said:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR PATTERSON.

I suppose you wish me to say something in regard to the schools of New Hampshire. You will appreciate the fact that we are doing something for the cause of education in that State, when I tell you that one out of every 100 of our population is a female teacher; and we have nearly six thousand male teachers, in addition. And this is, of course, a mere fraction of our teachers, — for we have furnished them for Rhode Island and Massachusetts, and the great West, and a few for the states down South as well. I think that the success of any system of education must be measured by the kind of men and women who have gone forth from its schools. As specimens of the product of our New Hampshire schools, we can show you a Judge Woodbury, a Judge Chase, a Daniel Webster, a Rufus Choate, — men who have left a profound impress upon the history of the country. But it is not to these illustrious products that we are to look mainly. It is to the great mass of the population, the men and the women who are to do the work of the country, and sustain our institutions, and carry forward and perpetuate

our civilization. And it is in the *schools* of our hard, cold granite New Hampshire that these men and women have been raised. It has been well said by the gentleman who has sent us the telegram from California, that it is not wealth which constitutes the power and prosperity of a state, but that it is educational institutions; that it is mind, quickened in the school, which conquers the forces of nature and transmits them into forms of beauty and utility.

There are advantages in being born in our mountain State. In the first place, I think that the spirit of the mountains works into the very constitution of the people. It it often said that the Swiss are indebted to the character of their country for their liberties and for the perpetuation of their institutions. I think there is something in it. And so it is wherever God has lifted into majesty and sublimity the surface of the earth, — you will find that there the people insensibly and intuitively drink in the very character of the scenery amid which they live; and if there comes a Thermopylæ, — if there comes a crisis in the history of that people,— you will find them standing in the fastnesses of their mountains, a barrier that cannot be overcome.

These mountains furnish the springs that are the sources of the Merrimack and the Connecticut, and other great rivers, — and on the Merrimack River there are more manufacturing institutions to-day than on any other river in this world, more spindles are turned, more looms are run, and more cotton and woolen fabrics are produced than on any other stream on God's footstool. It is these home products that are to give us perpetual prosperity; — for we, in our little New England,— that promontory that juts out into the sea, — cannot expect to compete, agriculturally, with the immense, rich prairies of the West, in the foreign markets of the world. But give us a Manchester and a Nashua, and we have a home market, and it is in these home markets that are to be found our power, and these home markets we are able to secure because of those hills of New Hampshire.

So that we are not a little proud of our granite hills. I know it is a little hard to climb them sometimes, and in these days we are inclined to think that we must have great ease

in the enjoyment of our institutions. But I think there is a mistake made about that. When I was a boy I used to have to go two and a half miles every day to school. Now in these days I find great complaint is made if a child has to go a mile to school. But we have been none the worse for these rough passages in our early experience. If a child is put into a downy cradle and set afloat gently down the stream of life, and no breeze rougher than a zephyr is allowed to touch its cheek, it will simply turn out a stupid dullard. If the rising generation are to fill the places of their fathers, and stand strong and true in the great crises that are sure to come upon this country, they must have a little of hardship and trouble and trial in their youth. They must learn to climb hills that are high.

President Orr then called upon Mr. Dibble, Principal of the High School, of Charleston, S. C., who said:

Address of Principal Dibble.

I come from a State that has been for the past ten years struggling under the greatest disadvantages. But though not "a city set upon a hill," we in Charleston propose to build an educational light-house that all the South can see. Mayor Courtney is now bending all his energies to developing the intellectual interests of the city. His greatest ambition — and I venture to predict that he will realize it — is to make Charleston what Athens was to Greece, or what Boston is to New England and the rest of the world.

I shall go away from this meeting quickened in my impulses of zeal and devotion to this cause. I shall go away knowing a great deal more in connection with the work in which I am engaged than I ever knew before. There is no one system of education of which it can be said that it is distinctively American. Each section has its peculiarities; and that system which would suit New England, or the Middle States, may not be exactly the system that would suit us in South Carolina. "*E Pluribus Unum*" is as much the educational as it is the political motto of this great Nation. You here have a great deal to impart to us; and I trust the day is not far distant when your National Association and

your American Institute may come to hold your meetings with us in Charleston, and find that we have got something there which will be helpful to you. What we most need at the South is the education of all the people. We mean to do our best, and reach all we can. But we cannot accomplish our task if left unaided. No man can form a conception of the difficulties which lie in our way. It is very illogical to leave us under a burden of ignorance that we cannot ourselves remove, and then hold us responsible for not preserving a respectable government, and one that protects every portion of society. Give us the means of educating all the people, and then hold us to strict responsibility.

Dr. J. H. Carlisle, President of Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C., who was next called upon, wished to add his testimony in respect to the social and intellectual benefits of this meeting. Seldom had he heard so many papers read, during a meeting covering the same number of days, in which so few side issues had been presented, and so much earnestness and sincerity evinced by the several speakers. No word of unkindness had entered into the deliberations. "May the impulses," said he, "which we have derived from this meeting last for years. In all our churches, homes, and schools, may the Father's blessing abide, and all the christian graces and virtues walk their perpetual circuit around the land of Washington."

President Mowry next alluded to the presence of Mr. John D. C. Hitz, of Switzerland, and called upon that gentleman for some remarks. Mr. H. said that he was proud to hail from the same country which had produced a Pestalozzi, one of the greatest benefactors of the age, whose work stood preëminently above that of any of the great men of Europe of the present day. Fröebel, also, was a name that was now exciting no little commotion among those occupied with the elementary branches of education. Not a century hence his name would stand side by side with that of Pestalozzi upon the scroll of fame, and the principles which underlay his system would be those upon which public instruction in this country would be based. The one instrumentality by which the liberties of Switzerland had been so long preserved, had

been the intelligence of her people. With ignorance, they would long ago have become an easy prey to ambitious despots. The American nation gives the ballot to all. Let it be careful that all are by education fitted and qualified intelligently to handle it.

After entertaining readings by Professor Churchill, President Orr called up, as the next speaker, Mr. Hewitt, of Illinois, who said:

The educational work of our great State is being more thoroughly done year by year. The schools are constantly improving. But there is a vast amount of work still to be done. We need in Illinois, just what you need in New England and everywhere throughout the country, — *live teachers*, — alive in feeling, in zealousness, in enthusiasm; who can sympathize with, and take advantage of the peculiarities of child-life. Without this it makes little difference how excellent our system or our methods may be. The poorest appliances and a bad method, often, in the hands of a really earnest, sympathetic, *live* teacher, will accomplish better results than the best appliances with a teacher who lacks the power that comes from inspiration and earnestness.

C. C. Coffin, Esq., was then introduced, to represent the State of Massachusetts. He referred in an interesting manner to the incidents connected with the planting of the first New England Colonies, and particularly to the inauguration of the common-school system by the Pilgrim settlers in early colonial days, and continued as follows: "How far that little candle throws its beams! It is flashed back to us to-night from the golden sands of the Pacific. Far away across the Pacific, the oldest of empires is being illuminated with the light of education to-day by teachers who have gone out from the State of Massachusetts. The institution organized so feebly on the sandy shore of Cape Cod is sending its influence down the ages. In many and widely distant sections of the globe men and women taught in the common schools of Massachusetts are kindling new fires for the enlightenment and salvation of the human race."

Mr. J. H. Berringer, of New Jersey, followed in a brief and very humorous speech.

Mr. Brinckley, of Georgia, spoke of the great benefit he had derived personally from attending this meeting; also of the enthusiastic interest which the people in this section of the country took in the work of education, and for the high standard they had set for their teachers.

Hon. Neil Gilmore was called upon to represent the Empire State. He said: "The future generation, so soon to take the place of those now crowding the busy walks of life, is to be exactly what we, as teachers, are now making it. Let us, above all things, strive to impress upon our pupils a sense of the dignity of labor. Let us never teach that education is to be a substitute for the cunning of the right hand, but rather that one of its main purposes is to put skill into the right hand,—fitting those who enjoy its benefits for practical usefulness in the world."

President Mowry then introduced to the audience the Hon. Henry Barnard, LL. D., of Connecticut, with fitting allusions to his great and well-known services in the educational cause. Mr. Barnard called up reminiscences of one of the first educational meetings for the improvement of public schools, held in this country. It was at Hartford, in 1826. It was my privilege, said he, through successive years which followed, to be present at other large conventions and associations, held in this country, long before I expected to take any active part in the work of popular education, and it gives me great pleasure to say that though one of those meetings was presided over by John Quincy Adams, in New York, nearly fifty years ago, and though among the speakers were such men as Albert Gallatin, William C. Woodbridge, and others as famous, it was not possible for the men of that period to have prepared such able papers as have been read before this convention during the last four days. The grandeur of this theme was not then appreciated. The mighty growth of this country was not then anticipated. The many institutions that would be required to supply its educational wants were not understood. It is the glory of the people of this country that there has been accomplished here the organization of more systems of public instruction, the establishment of more institutions of education, the con-

secration of more wealth for educational endowment, than the history of any other country, in the same length of time, can boast. After the consecration of nearly fifty years of my life to this cause, I still look forward with faith and hope, and believe, quoting the words I used nearly forty-two years ago, that "the cause of education still holds in its hand every other good cause,"—the cause of temperance, the cause of justice, the cause of religion. [Applause.]

PRESIDENT MOWRY: I beg to offer you this sentiment: "*The National Educational Association:* Having but just turned its majority, still a giant with already gigantic results; may its future be long and even more blessed than the past; and may the recollections on the part of all its members who are here present of the meetings we have now nearly brought to a close, always be pleasant memories."

Dr. Tappan, of Ohio, the incoming president of the National Educational Association, made a felicitous response.

PRESIDENT ORR: I offer, in behalf of the members of the National Educational Association, the following sentiment: "*The American Institute of Instruction:* We have long heard of the fame of this body, and have been made debtors to it by the instruction which we have received from its labors. Recent intercourse with the members will enable us hereafter to recognize them as friends."

President Walton replied in behalf of the Institute, to the above complimentary expression, in fitly-chosen words.

CLOSING ADDRESS OF EX-PRESIDENT ORR.

A word now, simply a parting word. I desire to say that I have felt very deeply the honor done me in calling me to preside over the National Educational Association. I have felt it the more deeply, as the call was made by my friends from New England, and from the Northwest, and from the Middle States, my own people having very little voice in the matter. I shall go away from this place feeling that I have many friends among the membership of the American Institute of Instruction. Much as I have enjoyed occasions of this sort in my own State of Georgia, I have never felt more

at home, I have never been more cordially and warmly received than I have been by the members of both of these bodies; and I shall return to my field of labor, feeling in my heart, not only that we have been greatly profited by being here, but that our friendships have been kindled afresh.

Closing Address of President Mowry.

Permit me also to say a valedictory word, personally and for the institution that I represent. I did feel, two years ago, very much trepidation as I came upon this platform, and received from President Carleton that semi-centennial gavel that I have now turned over to my successor. Our meeting last year, at St. Albans, was a very satisfactory meeting,— if we could forget the great sadness that was occasioned by the great calamity that came upon our country in that connection. President Garfield had made all arrangements to attend that meeting. He had, on that morning, left the White House and gone to the station to take the train which was to carry him to New Jersey, whence, with his family, he was intending to go up the Hudson River, visit his Alma Mater, to meet there his classmates,— he having been a graduate just twenty-five years. From there, the governor of the State of Vermont, with a military escort, was to receive him and carry him across to St. Albans. He was to address our convention there, and pass on in his journey to the White Mountains. I had just gone into my room, that Saturday morning, and sat down and thought over the arrangements, and I said to my wife, "Everything is now ready, I don't see a chance for a slip." While I was waiting there, the news came of the terrible calamity. But aside from that, our meeting was exceedingly pleasant. From there I went to Atlanta, to the meeting of the great National Association, so that those two grand meetings were brought into juxtaposition, — the one near the northern boundary of the Nation, and the other in Georgia. And there the arrangements were begun for this meeting, to be held jointly, by these two great associations of educators, meeting together for the first time in their history. It was with many misgivings and through many

difficulties that these arrangements were made; and I want to say for the officers of the National Association that nothing could have been more felicitous than the manner in which they have borne themselves in relation to the arrangements for this meeting, President Orr and his associates have done nobly. We have now brought this convention near its close; and it seems to me, from the expressions that I have heard on all sides, that we have had more excellent papers read, and discussed the underlying principles of education more thoughtfully, than at any previous meeting. I trust that the members of both associations will have occasion to be reasonably well satisfied with the arrangements that have been made and the way in which they have been carried out. I am sure, for one thing, that the fraternal pressure of the hand, the words of welcome and cheer, of friendship and affection, that have passed from one to another, have repaid us for coming here to Saratoga at this warm season of the year. We have had a pleasant meeting, and these interchanges of friendship and sociality between teachers from the East and the West, the North and the South, have been not only refreshing, but profitable to us all. I trust you will all have a safe journey to your homes, and may you be made more successful in your work as teachers by the instruction which you have here received.

After the singing of "Old Hundred" by the assemblage present, the convention was declared adjourned.

PAPERS AND LECTURES.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION.

FIFTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING,

SARATOGA, N. Y.,

JULY 11-14, 1882.

FIRST DAY, JULY 11.

I.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS TO THE CONVENTION,

By the President, William A. Mowry, Ph. D., Providence, R. I.

IT gives me much pleasure, as a representative of the oldest general educational association in this country, to extend cordial greetings to our friends here present from more than thirty states, at this great educational convention.

It is a happy omen for the future of our land, that we can gather such an assemblage of educators, amid the heat of these July days, in this famous watering-place of the Nation.

These large hotels and numerous boarding-houses were erected principally for pleasure-seekers, and they are usually filled during these summer months, with weary merchants and bankers; wealthy manufacturers in pursuit of pleasure, rest, recreation; in short, with a great variety of persons of various classes, but principally gathered here for rest and recreation.

But this week the guests of the good people of this beautiful village are largely school-mas-

ters and school-mistresses; committee-men and supervisors; superintendents, professors and college presidents. Here are *Artium Baccalaurii, Artium Magistri, Legum Doctores, et id omne genus,— omnes Honorandi et Reverendi.*

These men and women have come up here, not altogether for rest and recreation,— although it is devoutly to be hoped they will all find here the one and the other,— but they have gathered here from the East and the West, the North and the South, the Atlantic, the lakes, the gulf, the mountains and the shores of the Pacific, to consider the great problems of the educational work, to grapple with those questions and to get knowledge and strength with which they may more wisely, judiciously and successfully perform the difficult duties of our arduous profession.

It affords me especial satisfaction to welcome here this great aggregation of intellectual forces, as gathered under the folds of two grand educational banners. We have come together to hold a joint meeting of the two principal educational bodies of this country.

It will prove of no small advantage to us all, if we merely take each other by the hand and make acquaintances; the hard-working teachers of barren New England, comparing notes with those who labor upon the broad plains of the interior, in the fertile valleys of the South, and upon the rich slopes of the Sierras.

We are all fellow-craftsmen here; brethren and sisters; co-workers in the training of the young.

As such, I welcome you all to this great convocation; to the rich feast of sterling thought and of sound doctrine. I ask you to listen with modest and reverent attention to the profound papers which will be read before you; to enjoy and to participate in the brilliant and witty discussions; to receive with great solemnity and becoming gravity the philosophical platitudes which will here be presented; and to laugh with hearty appreciation at every successful attempt to perpetrate a joke, to tell a story, or to produce a pun.

Moreover, I counsel you to *eat* sparingly good food, to *drink* generously Saratoga waters, and to enjoy rest and relaxation; to walk and ride and drive; to go "via steamer" and "all rail," to return by another route; to buy round trip tickets, and to join all "personally conducted parties."

Do not go home till you have visited Lake George and Lake Champlain; or Howe's Cave and Watkins Glen; or Ausable Chasm and the Adirondacks; or Mauch Chunk and the Gravity Railroad; or Niagara Falls and the Thousand Islands; or the St. Lawrence and Montreal; or Quebec and the Saguenay; or the White Mountains. Above all, I charge you to *talk* . . . and I recommend you to go home through Boston.

Do not forget to give a careful examination to all school-books and school supplies on exhibition, and scan with due care the wonderful drawings which line the walls of the ball-room of Congress Hall.

I now pronounce this educational convention duly opened and inaugurated.

FELLOW-TEACHERS: I beg you will bear with me while I briefly call your attention to some suggestions upon the theme which I have chosen for this occasion, namely:

"WHAT SCHOOLS WILL DO FOR A PEOPLE."

Colonel Lockett, of Georgia, the well-known cotton-planter, who has in his employ several thousand hands, said at Atlanta, last summer: "I learned some years ago, an important fact; namely, that an intelligent person would pick more cotton and do it better than an ignorant one."

That fact was an important one. The inferences from it are startling. The simple work of picking cotton! Wholly mechanical and apparently requiring but the least possible brain power! Intelligence picks *more*, and does it *better!*

If this be so, then intelligence, which implies mental discipline, development, cultivation, is a commodity. It has a market value. If you in-

crease it, you add to the wealth of the nation. It affects production, and the cost of production. If all this applies to the poor freedman, or state convict, employed by Colonel Lockett in picking cotton, it certainly applies to the whole body politic — to all classes and all grades of the human family.

Here, then, is the key-note for universal education. But universal education necessarily means compulsory education; and compulsory education means education by the powers, the authority of the state. It necessitates taxation for education, and the control of education by law. Hence a system of public schools.

We have now arrived by induction to the principle that the property of the state may be taxed to educate the children of the state.

The founders of the several English colonies within what we now call New England early seized upon this great principle, and established the state and the government upon the maxim that the best interests of the commonwealth could be promoted only by careful attention to the moral character and the intellectual improvement and cultivation of the whole people.

Hence the church and the school-house, side by side, dotted the hills of the bleak New England towns.

What the town-meeting was to the political

structure, the district school was to the intellectual and moral growth of the people.

In 1606 the patent was issued. In 1614 John Smith called the country New England. In 1620 the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth and began a settlement. In 1636 Roger Williams proclaimed, at Providence, R. I., soul liberty. In 1639 the Bay Colony founded Harvard College. In less than two hundred years New England has established and liberally endowed more than twenty colleges, and the United States nearly four hundred! with 3,000 instructors and 30,000 students, with an income from invested funds of $3,000,000, and from tuition of $2,000,000, with libraries of 2,000,000 books, and with an endowment in buildings, grounds, and funds of nearly $50,000,000!

It is noticeable that the college and the preparatory schools, then called grammar schools, were first instituted, and afterwards the primary and common schools.

Should one suppose that the true order would be the primary school first and then the others by development from the primary, he would make a grave mistake. Theoretically and historically, the development comes from the college downward to the primary school, and never from the primary upward. It is essential that the higher education should be jealously guarded, in order to protect and foster the common education.

From the small but systematic beginnings at the planting of these New England colonies, large results have followed.

The common school is now an institution of the country.

In Massachusetts alone, in 1880, there were more than 6,000 public schools, with over 325,000 pupils, and more than $5,000,000 was expended for school purposes from money raised by taxation.

New England is conspicuous in our country for her interest in schools and her liberality in their management.

What are the results? The people of New England are justly noted for their high character in various directions;—for their industry, enterprise, inventive genius, general intelligence, rapid advancement in science and art;—they hold an enviable position in literature, poetry, and statesmanship; in bold daring, heroic bravery and pure patriotism; in their exemplification of broad philanthropy and benevolence; and in general high moral worth and true christian character.

In inventive genius and skill, perhaps no people on the globe can show a better record. The cotton-gin, the development and manufacture of the printing press, the sewing machine, and the steam-engine, the invention of the electric telegraph and the telephone, are only con-

spicuous instances among thousands of that development of inventive genius which has been the direct outgrowth of the New England system of public schools and higher education.

The patent-office report of five years ago (the only one I can now lay my hand on) reports from the six New England states a total of 2,479 patents granted, out of 13,612 for the entire country, including territories. This gives more than one-sixth of all the patents granted to less than one-eleventh of the population.

Connecticut had one patent granted for every 885 of her population. Rhode Island one to 1,025. Massachusetts one to 1,046. While the average for some states was less than one to 20,000, or even 30,000 population.

The total wealth of the whole country is more than $14,000,000,000, or an average of less than $375 to every inhabitant. The total wealth of New England is over $2,715,000,000 (nearly one-fifth of the whole), or an average of nearly $800 to every person. The largest wealth is in Rhode Island, with an average of about $1,125 to each inhabitant. The next is Massachusetts, whose average is about $1,100 to each.

The total value of cotton goods annually made in the United States is about $175,000,000, of which $130,000,000 (or about five-sevenths) is manufactured in New England.

Perhaps you will allow me to allude to the

clock trade. The total product annually made in the country is valued at about $3,000,000, of which $2,500,000 are made in Connecticut.

In passing through the interior of that noted State a few years ago, I chanced to stop an hour, waiting for a train, at a small village of very insignificant population, formerly called Plymouth Hollow, but later dignified by the name of Thomaston.

While waiting for the train an old gentleman, easy, affable, good-natured, walked up to the station from the little clock-factory down by the stream.

Entering into conversation in true Yankee style, I ventured to remark: "Your name is Thomas, is it not?"

"Oh yes, my name is Thomas, and always was—I mean it always shall be—Seth Thomas, of Thomaston, State of Connecticut."

"You make clocks here, I am told."

"Well, a few; not so many as they do down in New Haven."

"How many clocks do you make in a year, Mr. Thomas?"

"Well, about 250,000, but they make twice as many down in New Haven."

"Two hundred and fifty thousand! Pray where do you find a market for three-quarters of a million clocks made here and in New Haven

every year? I should think you would get the world supplied pretty soon."

"O, no trouble about that. We can hardly keep pace with the increase of population. We sell some in this country, but the *heft* of our trade is in China and Japan. Send a good many to Australia, though."

Just then the train came thundering in from the lower Naugatuck, and I went away thinking — "A million clocks manufactured annually in Connecticut, and most of them sold in China and Japan."

"We can hardly keep pace with the increase of population!"

[Of the statistics of the nutmeg trade, and the ham business, in Connecticut, I am unable to speak. Some of our friends here from other sections of the country would probably be able to give more exact and definite statistics than I can find in my Census Report.]

Of what New England has done in matters of government and in times of war I cannot speak at length.

Blot out from the annals of America the names and deeds of Samuel Adams, and John Adams, and James Otis; of Benjamin Franklin, and Nathaniel Greene; or Israel Putnam, and Joseph Warren; of John Quincy Adams, and Daniel Webster; of Henry Wilson, and Charles Sumner; and the multitude of their co-laborers,

—whose *names* even time would fail me to mention,—and the history of the great Republic would be only a series of disjointed fragments.

I trust many of you will see, before the close of this week, the spot where Col. Ethan Allen demanded the surrender of the old fort, "In the name of the Great Jehovah and the Continental Congress." That demand was instantly complied with.

And what shall I say of those other worthies, who have shown that "the *pen* is mightier than the sword?"

Let me recall to you the names of our lately deceased and widely mourned Longfellow, and Emerson and Bryant; of those earlier thinkers and writers and orators,—Jonathan Edwards, and Channing and Everett; of those famous teachers,—Francis Wayland, and Eliphalett Nott, and Jared Sparks; of Horace Mann, and Barnas Sears, and Samuel H. Taylor;—of the educators still living, Mark Hopkins and Henry Barnard, and John D. Philbrick; of the silver-tongued and golden penned, for whose prolonged lives still continued to us we are profoundly grateful, Wendell Phillips, Henry Ward Beecher, and John B. Gough; John G. Whittier, Harriet Beecher Stowe, and Oliver Wendell Holmes;—and there still rises to the mind a host of names of the living and of the dead, renowned and revered, as scholars, preachers, writers, statesmen,

philanthropists, reformers;—indeed, men and women distinguished in all the walks of life;—such names as William Lloyd Garrison and Horace Greeley, George Peabody and John F. Slater, Samuel F. B. Morse and Elias Howe; John A. Andrew and Joseph R. Hawley, Mrs. L. H. Sigourney and Lydia Maria Child; and may I add the name of *John Brown?* John Brown, the philanthropist of Providence, John Brown, the Revolutionary Patriot, John Newton Brown, the Baptist clergyman, and Capt. John Brown, of Ossawattomie.

There come up also to the mind the names of John Ledyard, the traveler; Adoniram Judson, the missionary; Joseph Story, the jurist; Henry Wheaton, the diplomatist; Eli Whitney, the inventor; Buckingham and Prentice, journalists; Noah Webster and Joseph E. Worcester, lexicographers; and so we might revel by the hour among the distinguished names that are found in the annals of New England.

In New England is Faneuil Hall, the birthplace of the American Revolution, and the Old South Church, and Bunker Hill, and Cambridge, and Lexington, and Concord. Here, also, are Plymouth Rock, and Salem, and Dorchester, and Providence, and *Boston*. Here, too, are Newport, and the White Mountains, and the Hoosac Tunnel.

Hardly less is New England distinguished by

the deeds of her children who have gone from her, than by those who remain with her.

Ireland is depopulated by the constant emigration which for so many years has been going on from her shores to America. The population of other countries has been seriously affected by similar causes. But during the last fifty years New England has sent much of her best blood to every state in the Union and to all the territories.

Her sons are in Ohio, and the Ohio Valley; in Mississippi, and the Mississippi Valley; in every state of the Missouri Valley; in all parts of the South; and in California and Oregon in large numbers.

But she is neither depopulated nor impoverished. Her brain power has been sufficient to guide and direct the thousands of laborers, imigrants from the Old World and from the neighboring British Provinces, who have come to perform the manual labor which was laid down by those hardy sons who have emigrated to the newer and more fertile fields of the South, the Interior, and the West.

And wherever these sons and daughters of the East have gone in large numbers, they have established the New England system of schools. In many places these schools, in the newer states, are already of high grade, and in some

instances, are even superior to those of the mother states.

The Nation has quite as much to hope for in its future from this general planting of the New England system of town governments and of public schools and colleges throughout the interior and the Pacific states, as from any other of the hopeful signs of the times for the future of this great Republic.

Already in the five states carved out of the old "Territory northwest of the Ohio," is established and in successful operation a system of education, carried there largely by New England emigrants, which would do honor to any of the older communities. Perhaps the University of Michigan, whose honored president, himself a New Englander, is on our programme as lecturer at this meeting, may be considered the keystone of the arch; and what grandeur there is in that Educational Arch!

Based upon the common schools in all the townships of that great State, have grown up the various high schools, giving free instruction to all who come, either to prepare for the higher walks of business life, or to fit for the college; and then at the expense of the State furnishing free instruction in a well-arranged college course, a course which for fullness, thoroughness and completeness, challenges comparison with the oldest and best endowed colleges in the land;

and offering the very best facilities, under exceptionally favorable terms, for professional study;—surely, here is a *system* of education which, if made universal through all the states, will aid materially in throwing far forward into the dim and distant future the downfall of this free government, which has so often and so boldly been prophesied by the pessimists and oligarchists of the monarchical despotisms in the Old World.

Whatever missing links there may be which tend to leave unproved the Darwinian theory of evolution, one thing is certain, viz.: that the world is becoming wiser and better.

It is not only increasing in knowledge, but it is growing in wisdom, that "wisdom which is profitable to direct."

To this end and for this purpose, "the schoolmaster is abroad." It is needful that this increase of knowledge and this growth in wisdom shall go on.

Great improvements have already been made in the science and art of government. The lively experiment made by this country in the art of self-government by a great people, has had a wonderful influence upon the nations of Europe.

Kossuth and Garibaldi learned their best lessons from America. For a full century this Nation, born in obscurity, weakness and poverty, has been growing, growing by internal improvements, by actual development of the re-

sources of the land, the soil, and the mines, by using the streams, the lakes, and the coast; growing also by accretion and absorption — by the universal law of attraction, the attraction of the less toward the greater.

We have now an immense area, and a great population. Yet this whole country has been held together by affinities.

Through many troubles and trials, through much suffering and great difficulties, our government has continued to grow stronger, and we believe wiser and better. It is entirely and emphatically a government "of the people, for the people, and by the people." Community of interests to-day binds together this great people, from the rising to the setting sun.

Neither diversity of interests nor political demagogism has yet succeeded in destroying or breaking asunder the great Republic.

If it continues to hold together in the future it will be from community of interest, produced by general intelligence and constant inter-communication.

Its greatest danger will come in the future, as in the past, from selfish and unprincipled demagogues. The influence of such political leaders upon the people is inversely in proportion to the intelligence of the masses. Hence it follows that the great safeguard of republican institutions lies in the education of the people.

I congratulate you, Fellow Teachers, therefore, upon the high and noble calling in which you are engaged. I call your attention to the importance of the work that is demanded of you, and the greatness of the results that flow from a faithful and successful discharge of those duties.

I charge you to be diligent in this business, to elevate your profession, and to see that the Republic receives no detriment. Finally, I would bring to your remembrance, as an incentive to laborious fidelity, the grandness and the certainty of the Christian hope, "having respect unto the recompense of the reward."

"God is a Spirit." His greatest gift to mankind is the spiritual life. Herein is immortality. It is the work of the teacher to fan into a glowing and burning flame the spark of intellectual spirituality which the Creator has kindled in the soul of every child.

The culture of the intellect, the education of the will, and the growth of the moral forces, is the task set for the teacher. It is the development of the germ into manhood and womanhood; into citizens and patriots and Christians.

May your work be done with fidelity, and may God—as He will—crown your efforts with great success.

II.

LIMITS OF ORAL TEACHING.

By Hon. J. W. Dickinson, A. M., Sec. Mass. Board of Education.

THE question to what extent should oral teaching be practiced in the schools, must be answered, if it is answered at all, by bringing before our minds the true nature of the act, and the results it is designed to accomplish.

This may be done: 1st. By defining oral teaching. 2d. By showing what ends such teaching is adapted to secure. 3d. By determining the true ends to be accomplished by pupils at school. 4th. By comparing the ends oral teaching is adapted to produce, with the ends to be accomplished, and from the comparison to find what is the province or limit of oral teaching.

1st. What is oral teaching? I will attempt to answer this question by: 1st. Defining teaching as a general act, without attaching to it any of those limitations which describe a particular kind; — then, by adding some restrictions, I will

define oral teaching as one of the kinds which may be supposed to exist.

In order that the definition of teaching may be intelligible to all, and that all may understand it in the same sense, it must be derived from illustrations of the significant terms employed in its construction.

One of these terms is culture, sometimes called training, or discipline, or education, but all naming the same idea.

By observation and experience we know that a continued thinking of any object or subject of thought, produces a facility in performing that mental act.

We know, also, that if the mind has a continued practice in controlling the body in any of its physical movements, it will acquire a facility in the exercise of its controlling power over these movements.

The facility produced or acquired by the continued exertion of active power is culture. The facility acquired for controlling mental activity simply, is called mental culture: the facility gained for controlling the body is physical culture.

In the truest sense of the term there is no culture but mental; for there is no facility of acting, but mental facility. But as the culture in the one case expresses itself in the character and intensity of our mental acts, and in the other in

the ready and orderly movements of the body, we are accustomed to speak of training the hand and the eye and other organs of the body. Let it be understood, then, that by mental and physical culture is meant the facility the mind acquires in producing mental states and in using the organs of the body.

Another significant term is knowledge. This term is often confounded with the terms idea and thought. Such confounding is fatal to all clear and distinct notions of our mental operations, or of our mental products.

The word idea is a name for the immediate object of consciousness whenever the mind enters upon any of its activities. Ideas are those mental products that furnish the powers with the materials for acting. Ideas spring up in the mind when an object of thought is presented. They are designated by simple names, as form, color, cause, effect, right, wrong.

The existence in the mind of ideas renders all mental processes possible. Thinking would be impossible without ideas, for thinking consists in comparing ideas, as when we compare our idea of the color of an object with our idea of some particular color; or our ideas of a moral act with our ideas of right and wrong.

Ideas are the immediate objects of consciousness whenever occasions for them are presented to the mind. Thoughts are acts of comparison

of ideas. Knowledge differs from either ideas or thoughts, as may be known from an illustration.

The proposition, "The ball is round," expresses some knowledge, which the mind may obtain. If we analyze the expression we may discover in what the knowledge itself consists. The word ball, names with other ideas, that of a certain form. The word round, also names an idea. If we compare the two ideas with each other we shall be conscious of their agreement. By a similar process, the mind may become conscious of the disagreement of ideas.

A consciousness of either the agreement or disagreement of ideas is knowledge.

An object of knowledge is anything of which the mind may be at any time knowing. The term object is commonly applied to an external thing, while the term subject names any mental state which may become an object of thought. A plant may be an object, a state of mind or any science may be a subject of knowledge.

To present an object or subject of knowledge to the mind of a learner is to make it hold such a relation to him as to lead him to think of it. An object, as a mineral, is presented to the mind of the learner by bringing it before his powers of observation, so that he can see its color, and form, and the visible changes it may be made to exhibit; that he may feel through muscular re-

sistance its hardness and weight, and that he may become conscious through appropriate senses of its other qualities. A subject, as a thought or emotion, may be presented by leading the mind of the learner to produce it for itself. Thoughts and emotions are products of mental activity, and the mind may make them objects of thoughts by thinking the one and feeling the other.

Ideas are distinguished from other products of the mind, by noting their origin, the relation they hold to other products and states of the mind, and by noting their forms of expression. Thoughts are acts of comparison. Knowledge is a consciousness of the agreement or disagreement found by comparison.

Having illustrated the meaning of the terms culture and knowledge, the term method may be considered and defined.

There are two ways by which the mind may attempt to gain knowledge. One way is to consider every object of knowledge first as a comprehensive or an extensive whole,—that is as an individual or as a class with all its parts and qualities forming a unit,—subsequently the attention is directed to the parts or qualities in their order, as they are mentally separated by analysis. Finally, as a last act in the process, the parts are combined so as to form again the whole from which they were mentally taken. Another way by which the mind may try to gain knowledge,

is to first consider the parts or elements of a whole as independent units, then to attempt to combine these parts into the whole of which they may be the parts. Finally, as a last act in the process, the whole may again be separated into the parts of which it is supposed to be formed.

The first way of acquiring knowledge, and which commences with analysis and ends with a synthesis, is called the analytic process.

The second way, commencing with a synthesis and ending with an analysis, is called the synthetic process. Both ways may be illustrated, in so far as elementary knowledge is concerned, by reference to the two ways employed in teaching and in learning to read.

To introduce words as wholes, and afterwards, if required, to analyze them into their elements, is to employ the analytic process. To begin with the letters, or with the elements of words, and afterwards to construct them into words, is to use the synthetic process.

A way of teaching or of learning is a method of doing these things. There is an analytic and a synthetic method of acquiring knowledge, and of communicating knowledge to others. The two methods are radically distinct from each other. They may be known by observing the way which a learner or a teacher may choose to follow of beginning his processes of learning or of teaching. If he brings before the mind at the

first the whole object of study, as a plant, or a mineral, or a word, or the whole subject, as botany, or mineralogy, or language, he is employing the analytic method. But if he begins with the elements of a thing, or with the individuals of a class in his elementary or scientific study, then he uses the synthetic process, an impossible process for a learner to pursue, as he who has not first known a whole cannot of himself construct either elements or parts into that whole.

Lastly, what is meant by the term act?

If we produce a change in an external thing or in a state of mind by a voluntary effort, we perform an act. An act is something done.

Having now illustrated the significant terms that enter into the definition of teaching, we are prepared to give an intelligent statement of the definition itself.

Teaching is the act of presenting objects and subjects to the mind of the learner for knowledge, mental training, and a method of thinking and acting. Knowledge, training or culture, and a method by which these two things are produced, are the ends for which the act of teaching is performed.

Teaching, as thus defined, is a general act, not limited to any particular kind. Oral teaching is supposed to be a kind, and may be distin-

guished by pointing out the difference between it and any other kind of teaching.

That teaching which presents the object or subject to be known is objective teaching.

If in presenting the thing to be known, the teacher uses such spoken words of his own as are necessary to direct the pupil in thinking, the act may be called oral objective, or simply oral teaching.

Having defined oral teaching in such a way as to bring the act clearly and definitely before our minds for investigation, the next effort will be to show what ends it is adapted to produce.

And first, it furnishes the only right occasions for the acquisition of knowledge, as it always presents the very thing to be known. This fact should arrest our attention.

It is well known by those who direct their attention to their own experiences, or who are accustomed to make observations on the experiences of others, that very much of the mental labor performed in the schools utterly fails to take hold of the true objects of knowledge.

The learner studies, but his mental operations stop on the forms of speech to which they are directed. He recites his lessons, but this is no more than to reproduce and give expression to the forms of speech he has learned. His acquisitions are of words which hold, in his mind, no relation to the ideas that the words were in-

tended simply to name. This unproductive result is due to the use of that method of teaching, even now so generally practiced, which presents to the pupil words instead of things. The oral teacher abandons such practices, and uses language in teaching as it was intended to be used, — simply as the means of *expressing* our knowledge, and uses things as they were intended to be used, as the *occasions* of our knowledge.

2d. Oral teaching leads to mental training, as it requires the mind of the pupil to perform for itself all those acts which produce knowledge, and these are the acts which produce the mental training also.

It should be remembered that we acquire a facility in doing only what we are accustomed to do. Memorizing words will train the mind to an easy performance of that act, but it will have no tendency to give facility in the acquisition of ideas of things. When our pupils leave school to take hold of real life, and are put to an independent activity in dealing with things, they often feel like strangers in a strange country.

Their intellectual and spiritual guides are taken away. It is not enough now that they simply comprehend the ideas other minds have invented, or repeat the discourses which they have found recorded in the books. They must now live a distinct individual life, and find the power of living within themselves.

They would be able to do this if their active powers had been rightly trained at school.

That teacher gives evidence that he comprehends the nature of his task, who brings into the presence of his pupils whatever they are to know and do, directs them in their learning and doing, but beyond that leaves them to independent work. Such a teacher is an oral teacher.

3d. Oral teaching communicates the right method of study and of performing all mental acts; for it presents to the pupil the real objects of study, and in the same orderly manner as the pupil should acquire the power of presenting them to himself after his school-days are over and he is left to self-control.

It has been shown that there are two methods for the mind to employ in obtaining knowledge —the analytic and the synthetic. The use of the first requires the object of knowledge with all its parts and elements and relations of parts, to be before the mind of the learner at the first.

When the mind has known the object as a unit, it is to unloose the parts from one another by analysis, and consider them in themselves and in their relations. In this way only can the mind of the student conduct itself to a successful and independent activity in the study of any object or branch of knowledge.

If the fragments of any complex unit are taken up before the unit as such has been observed,

they can present nothing more than the occasion for a knowledge of smaller units, independent of one another. The relations that bind them into a larger whole cannot be discovered, for the mind of the independent investigator has no guide to them until he sees the larger whole itself. A synthetic method of independent study is impossible. There can be synthetic teaching, but the synthetic teacher simply explains, and calls upon his pupils to understand him.

He presents his lessons to classes rather than to individual pupils, and in the form of lectures. If his subject is mineralogy and the topic quartz, he tells the class how hard the mineral is, and in what form it crystalizes.

He says it will resist the action of acids and a high degree of heat. He speaks of its lustre and its uses, and closes his discourse by stating what proportion of the earth's crust is made of quartz.

In his lecture on physiology he will describe the organs of the body, their functions, and the processes by which the body is built up and kept in repair. In chemistry he will describe the elements of matter, and explain the changes that affect the identity of bodies.

In the study of mental phenomena he will define the mind, describe its different modes of activity, and enunciate the laws that control mental development.

In civil polity he will define the state, and explain what are the principles and forms of civil government, and what are the ends to be secured by its existence.

Three points are to be noticed in connection with such teaching:

1st. Language instead of things is used as the occasion of ideas.

2d. There is an attempt to lead the pupil to combine simple ideas of qualities and parts so as to form complex ideas of wholes, though the wholes have never been observed. If we could put ourselves for a time in the place of the pupils under such teaching, we should either be conscious of nothing or we should be conscious of attempting to form ideas in our minds similar to those supposed to exist in the mind of our teacher.

We should say to ourselves, what does the teacher mean by his expressions, rather than what is the real nature of the object that should be in our presence.

After the lesson has been given, if we as learners have been successful, we shall know what our instructor thinks of things, though we may have vague or false notions of the things themselves.

It will be observed by reference to the illustrations of synthetic teaching already given, that the teacher described the material objects and

mental states which he attempted to bring before his pupils, by affirming one by one their qualities and attributes. As such descriptions fall on the ear of the learner, he will attempt to combine these qualities and attributes into the complex wholes of which they are the parts or elements. But as he has no knowledge of the wholes to guide him in his constructive acts, the products of these acts will be creatures of the imagination, with nothing in nature corresponding to them. And such, unfortunately, is the character of much of what we call knowledge, because it has been derived from a wrong method of teaching and study.

3d. Teaching by lectures or by books, requires the pupil to receive information.

If such teaching accomplishes all it attempts, it may do nothing more than to awaken to activity the passive powers of the student in comprehending what is taught.

If we turn our attention to the three ends which oral teaching is adapted to produce, we shall find that they are the true ends the schools should attempt to accomplish.

Finally, what are the limits within which oral teaching should be confined?

This question may be answered by referring to the character of such teaching as it is presented in the definition already given, and to the ends it seems adapted to produce.

Is there any kind of knowledge which oral teaching is not adapted to occasion? There is the knowledge of facts relating to material things, and of facts relating to the human mind to be obtained. Oral teaching observes an immutable law of the mind in directing the attention of the learner at first to the facts themselves, rather than to the representations of them.

There is scientific knowledge of things and of mental states to be acquired. Oral teaching turns the mind of the scientific student back upon his knowledge of facts, and there springs out of it a knowledge of the general truths which he seeks.

Are there any conditions for the acquisition of knowledge which oral teaching does not observe? The conditions to be observed in the acquisition of elementary knowledge, are the presence to the mind of the learner of the true objects of thought and the existence of mental faculties strong enough and well trained enough to perceive them. The conditions for scientific knowledge are the consciousness of facts, and faculties trained to generalize and classify them. Oral teaching does all that teaching can do to establish the conditions for both elementary and scientific knowledge. Is it not also adapted to occasion all those mental processes that produce mental development?

Oral teaching does not mean talking, or lectur-

ing, or pouring knowledge from one mind into another, nor does it mean freedom from hard and systematic study by the pupil himself. The oral teacher directs the pupil in the exercise of his faculties, and then requires him to think his own thoughts and perform his own acts. He is careful to observe the laws of human development by contenting himself with simply establishing the conditions of right activity, and then he leaves his pupils to engage in an independent struggle for their acquisitions.

Books in abundance may be used and lectures may be given, but they are to be used to call the mind of the student to a fresh and more thorough study of what has before been taught; they are not to be used as the original sources of knowledge.

In the sense in which I have considered the subject, and in the sense in which those who have made teaching a successful study consider it, there is no limit to which oral teaching, as a method of teaching, should be subjected.

It may easily be abused by those who are ignorant of that which is to be taught, or of the relations that one kind of knowledge holds to another, or of the true ends that school-life is designed to accomplish.

It can be applied with the most exalted results only by those teachers who have had a success-

ful experience, or a thorough professional training.

The successful oral teacher must himself know what he is to teach. He must be acquainted with the human faculties he is to unfold and discipline.

He must know the ends which the pupil is to secure for himself by his efforts at school, and then with the skill which learning and experience give, he can stand up in the presence of his pupils and direct them to those objects of study and to those forms of activity which are best adapted to produce knowledge and human development.

We are ready now in this country for a thorough change in our methods of teaching. We know the truth, and the time has come for us to choose it. It is already too late in the history of our schools to teach them without a plan and without directing school-work to definite results. The children must no longer be deprived of the advantages of self-activity. They must no longer be required to sit passively under instruction, doing no more for themselves than to receive ideas invented by other minds. They must be treated as though they had the sources of power within themselves. They must simply be directed by their teachers, and the rest must be a personal struggle for the good ends which an earnest, well-ordered life offers to all.

DISCUSSION.

DR. I. W. ANDREWS, President of Marietta College, Ohio, said: I have been very much interested in this paper, and rise merely to ask the writer of it if he cannot make a little plainer one or two of the distinctions therein given. If I understand him, he disapproves of what he calls synthetic instruction. He alludes to a number of topics of study to which he would apply his system. I wish he would take, for instance, the subject of "Civil Government," and show a little more at length the distinction between the analytic method, which he would approve, and the synthetic method, of which he would disapprove. I am inclined to think, from the profound nature of the paper,—perhaps we might almost say its abstract character,—that a little fuller amplification on some of these points would make us all understand it better. I am persuaded that there is a great deal of truth there, and yet it does not lie on the surface, and perhaps it requires a little too much thinking on our part to grasp it without a little more help from him.

MR. DICKINSON. I almost fear to attempt to answer the question asked by President Andrews. He has given a subject somewhat difficult in its nature to use as an illustration. In preparing our topics for teaching we have to give them a pretty careful study. Now before I can use "Civil Government" as a means of illustration I should have to think over the subject and see precisely how I would present it. But I will attempt even that. If I were to teach "Civil Polity," for instance, which is a knowledge of the forms and principles of civil government, the

first thing I should do would be to present "a state," and I should stand before my class and say to them (taking a small state), "Massachusetts is a state. Let us analyze it and find in what the state consists." And it would be ascertained by analysis, as Massachusetts itself is presented to the pupil, that there is to be found in it a community of persons; that is one element of a state found by analysis. These persons are confined within a limited territory; that is another thing. They are working together for some common ends; that is another thing. They are acting under self-imposed rules; that is another. And so I lead the class on from one thing to another, until every thing is analyzed and found that constitutes the state. The whole having been presented first, and these particulars found by analysis, then the pupils have simply to combine these parts into the whole, by a synthetic act, and to define "the state." And in that way would I teach every topic in civil polity, by presenting the thing itself to be known, by leading my pupils to observe that thing which is brought out before their minds, and by analysis to find all those particulars by means of which the civil state is to be known from any other object of thought. And the pupils would be conscious, not of giving attention to me and to my words, but of attending to the true subject of their thoughts. They would not even know that I was present. But they would all be thinking of the thing to be known; and that is one of the great ends to be secured in teaching. And it seems to me now that if I could pass through my course again as a student, nothing should I desire so much as to have my teacher put into my hand anything and everything that

he called upon me to know, whether it were a material or a spiritual thing. [Applause.]

MR. JOHN BELLOWS: I have no quarrel at all with the general spirit of the paper. It seemed to me admirable throughout. But it occurred to me at several points that it is very desirable to let these two methods of teaching, the synthetic and the analytic, alternate; to let the method of teaching adapt itself to the particular part of the subject taught. Now the writer himself began by defining "culture." He went on to define "knowledge." He went on step by step until he approached "teaching." He then diverged to "oral teaching," and it seemed to me that he was using the method that he theoretically disapproved of. Now while we all find, I suppose, in our practical work as teachers, that the synthetic method is a false one in relation to certain subjects, or in certain departments of a subject, it is exactly the one to follow in others, and it seemed to me exactly the one that the lecturer should follow in presenting the subject which he has presented to our attention. He first carefully defined the terms that he was going to use. Without an exact conception of what he meant by those terms, our understanding of what followed would have been vague. That method, therefore, was tried, up to that point. It was perfectly right for him, in the remainder of the effort, to follow a different method. And so he must, it seems to me, intermingle the two, and not follow blindly and obstinately either one.

MR. DICKINSON. The statement is a good one. And as I taught by the lecture what I did teach, I was obliged somewhat to contradict my own points in doing it. But we always have,

in every branch of study, two courses. The first is called an elementary course, and the second a scientific. In the elementary course we teach the facts that are to be used in the scientific course,—in classifying those objects of knowledge which we have studied first as individuals. But whenever we observe a fact, that fact itself is presented to us. Now we begin, in the elementary course, with simple qualities, or elements, or facts. In the scientific course we begin with a definition. I have adopted, in order to be clear, both these courses. The first part of my paper was an "elementary course." When I came to the definition, I began my "scientific course"; and then I presented a definition of teaching. I proceeded to analyze it, according to my own method. But you remember that, when I presented the facts themselves, I presented the very thing to be known, first, and then left the mind to find out what it was, by its own observation. So that I did not violate, after all, the principle, but carefully followed it. Thus, in all our plans of teaching we must remember that we have one end to accomplish, in the elementary course,—as in the first part of my paper. We have another end in the scientific course which I spoke of at the last, when I said, "Let us now attend to what I have said, and find out what is true of it."

Dr. Stone, of Springfield, Mass.: Without intending to discuss the paper, it seems to me that not only the subject, but the method of treatment is very opportune at this time. While the young teachers are looking about to get light on "oral teaching," we know there is a great deal of miscellaneous talk and lecturing,

without plan, without method, without any philosophical principle at the bottom of it. Now it seems to me that what teachers need is this: A brief, concise statement of the principles which lie at the bottom of this matter. And that is one thing which I like in the paper that was presented; and that was the only thing I rose to speak about.

MR. Z. RICHARDS, of Washington, D. C.: I take it for granted that Dr. Dickinson spoke to us not as to persons ignorant of everything he was going to talk about. If we had known nothing of what he was expecting to talk about he probably would have commenced with "the whole,"—with one single idea. But he has taken it for granted that we do know something, and that we know a great many things in a kind of scattered way, but that it was necessary in order to be understood in what he said that he should make these distinct definitions. If we were a class of children, to receive instruction for the first time on any particular topic, say—"oral teaching," or "the limits of oral teaching,"—he would have taken it in an entirely different way, it seems to me. I cannot conceive how he could have possibly taken up the subject in a more philosophical and natural way, in order that we might understand exactly what he meant by "oral teaching." I don't know that the doctor had that idea in his mind. But it seemed to me that he struck exactly the point, talking to us as knowing something, and knowing a great many things in a confused manner, and has now brought us right down to the point where we can go to work and teach others, who know

nothing — our children, who are to learn for the first time whatever they learn.

Dr. J. W. Hoose, of the Cortlandt, (N. Y.) Normal School: I rise to ask the author of the paper a question or two, that spring up in my mind, in reference to "oral teaching," as applied in the public schools, and the results, as shown with children. As to the fact, so far as I am aware, children in our public schools (calling the first year in school five to six, or six to seven, or whatever the first grade may be, and so on up) — children reaching the upper grades seem to be deficient in the power to understand the text,— printed matter. These children have been taught without the text. The teacher has been the person who has presented the matter,— in arithmetic, geography, language, etc. The children have concerned themselves with the reading-book text *as* a reading-book, and not as a book out of which to get matter, if you please. That being the fact, so far as I am aware (I know it is a fact in many schools and systems of schools), that being the fact, I raise the question whether there is not a limit to "oral teaching," *i. e.*, this side of the limit put by the author of the paper. It is a question that I have studied with a great deal of interest, and, I confess, with a great deal of perplexity. Suppose an arithmetic to be put into the hands of pupils in the fourth grade (that is the fourth year in school), take an example such as the book for that age would have, and often the children will be relatively helpless to understand that example from reading it. An incident here will illustrate my point. A father said to me that his son (I suppose the son would be in, it may be, the eighth or ninth grade, some-

where) would come home and ask him questions about United States History, which he was pursuing in school, and the father would say to him (the father, by the way, was a graduate of Yale, I think, and a very intelligent gentleman), "Why that matter you ask me about is all in the book there. Why don't you read it?" The boy would answer, "I cannot understand it. I don't know what it means,"—a simple narrative statement. Now, that is a type of the defect (I call it a "defect"), that is a type of the state of mind of the children brought up by that process of oral presentation. Now, there may be defects in the way of presenting; but here is what I call a lamentable condition of things. Now, "How will 'oral teaching' bring about a reformation in that state of things?" is the question upon which I wish light. The paper says that pupils must learn to think for themselves. That is all right. I agree with it. I submit whether it is not a part of a good education to learn to think the thoughts of others. Some person has said that the created objects of nature are "the thoughts of God," and that the scientist, in the highest privilege, "thinks the thoughts of the Almighty." Now the thoughts of men exist in language. Is it not, Mr. Chairman, a part of the province of the educator to bring up the children so that they may think the thoughts of those gone by? Now where does all this field come in? I ask it for information. I present the question because I don't quite see my way through it from the paper.

One other point, bearing on the same subject. The paper remarks to the effect that we may know what the teacher thinks about a thing while we are ignorant of the thing about which

the teacher is talking. I want to raise a general question on that. With all deference in the world to the paper and the author of it, I question whether it is possible, in the nature of things, that I can appreciate, comprehend, what a man thinks of a subject, when that subject is not before me, so that my thoughts and my feelings may be touched, if you please, by the one commenting upon it. A man reaches my heart most upon the subject of patriotism when my own heart is full of patriotism; and when my own heart has not much knowlege of patriotism that man's instruction upon the subject of patriotism in some way does not warm me up. So with subjects generally.

Now there are fundamental questions concerning which we seek light. I don't object to them, but I don't see clearly enough how we are coming out with them; that is all; and I ask Mr. Dickinson in regard to these points for my information and guidance in practical school-work.

MR. DICKINSON: I don't care to take up more time myself. One of the good results following "oral teaching" is to train the pupils to ask one question at a time. I will introduce Professor Greenough, of Rhode Island, and ask him to speak to those points which Dr. Hoose has touched upon.

PROFESSOR GREENOUGH: May I be instructed as to which side of the question I shall speak upon?

THE PRESIDENT: If you speak for Mr. Dickinson you will speak on his side. Talk your own thoughts.

PROFESSOR GREENOUGH: There is truth on both sides, and something to be said farther on

both sides. When Dr. Hoose puts the question whether pupils can advance by means of written language, he puts a fair question. A question, perhaps, that is not touched upon in the paper, and a question that needs solution. When Mr. Dickinson arose here to-day, to teach us "to present the whole State of Massachusetts," he used the words "to present the whole," which he analyzed in presence of Dr. Andrews, carrying out the idea expressed by my friend Mr. Richards, that he supposed us to know something; and it is well for you to notice one expression in the paper that is guarded, and that is, that objects, or subjects, of thought are the primary occasions of knowledge, and that when a man has gained ideas and thoughts by his own observation and thinking, the printed page may be used, not merely as a means of reproducing those thoughts, but as a means of leading the pupil to combine those ideas and thoughts, and come to ideas, not those that are originally new, but new in the sense that they are new products by the combination of the ideas already gained.

Now in reference to the limitations,— for I have something to say now on the other side of the subject of "oral teaching,"— the question put by Dr. Hoose I do not regard as implying or involving limitations to the oral instruction that has been presented. Not at all. I would rather say that Dr. Hoose has suggested to my mind the relations of this oral instruction to lecturing. He has rather suggested to us this thought, that oral instruction, if properly given, makes it possible for the pupil to use the books. It also suggested to my mind this thought, that oral instruction was not limited to mere things that we can

handle, as minerals or flowers, but that it is the part of the oral instructor to take those very objects that are embodied in print. In translation the passage becomes the "object." After the pupil has gained a knowledge of the multiplication table, and of the fundamental processes of arithmetic, by oral instruction, problems become "objects" that are to be put before him, and he is to understand the construction of problems that he may pass from this written expression, as an "object," to the thought that it embodies. Therefore, I stop at this point, fearing that I shall be called to answer more questions, and leave the question open to some one else.

DR. HOOSE: I would like to ask the gentleman a question before he takes his seat,— a question upon this last point,— that the problem that is to be presented to the pupil, after he is familiar with the process, is "an object." I accept that. But here is a fact:— you take children, we will suppose, four, five, or six years in school. You write the problem on the board, and the teacher reads it to the pupils. They will solve it. But give them the same thing in the text, and they cannot read it so as to solve it. Now there is the practical difficulty which I find in this case, which the professor, permit me to say, has not quite relieved my mind of.

PROFESSOR GREENOUGH: I want to say in reference to that point, that the object must be presented in its different relations and different lights.

DR. STONE, of Springfield, Mass.: I would like to ask Dr. Hoose a question, and that is:— In the case of the boy he mentioned, assuming he was an average boy, whether the doctor really

thinks that boy had been taught according to the true principles of oral teaching? Now I stated when I was on my feet before that there is a great deal of miscellaneous talk, entertaining of pupils, lecturing before them, that is not "oral teaching." Does the gentleman think that that boy was taught according to the true principles of "oral teaching"?

DR. HOOSE: Dr. Dickinson, sitting between Dr. Stone and myself, after he has got us pitted against each other, now seeks to withdraw. That will do for a Massachusetts man, — from Boston. We who belong to New York, have to get along in a different way, — we have to take what we can get. But to treat this matter seriously, I think that these pupils *were*, as teaching goes, well taught. I answer it directly. This case that I cited was a type of the results of the system of teaching. I recognize, Mr. Chairman, that the system of teaching is responsible for the results, as well as the teachers. I am not willing to stand as a teacher, and hold myself as a teacher responsible for all the results of the school-room, independent of the system followed by the teacher. Now then, here is a system of teaching which produces certain results. Are they uniform, if you please, so that they constitute a mark of the system? Now if Dr. Stone asks me whether the principles of "oral teaching," as expounded by the paper, were followed, I am not quite prepared to answer him. I don't think I could say "yes" to it, and I am not prepared to say "no." I am in a state of "lack of knowledge" on the subject. But so far as oral teaching is generally concerned and followed by

the teacher,— leading the children along, as it is called,— it was "oral teaching."

A MEMBER: Was there any book-teaching with it?

DR. HOOSE: Yes sir, and the results of the book-teaching were illustrated by the condition of mind. Whether it is by a necessary consequence, I am not prepared to say. Here is a state of things, and I wanted to see my way out of it. Now I have answered Dr. Stone.

DR. STONE: Dr. Hoose comes right squarely to the point. In my city I go into schools and find teachers pursuing oral instruction, as they call it. I can pick out cases as bad as that of the boy he mentions there, the legitimate product of that kind of teaching. But I insist upon it, that that kind of teaching is not what I understand by true "oral teaching." I will not say anything about the paper; but I say there is teaching that *is* teaching, and there is such a thing as "oral teaching," which is based upon the principles of the human mind. But this miscellaneous way of imparting information to pupils, is not "oral teaching." I think true "oral teaching" can afford to stand on its merits. But don't let us hold that system responsible for this kind of work that I have mentioned, and which, I think, produces these results that are so unsatisfactory to Dr. Hoose, and as much so to myself.

DR. MERRICK LYON, of Providence, R. I.: I would like to ask if the gentleman means to say that in his part of the country they don't use any written language or books in teaching?

DR. HOOSE: They use them from the first year up.

DR. LYON: Then don't they have some kind of instruction besides "oral instruction"?

DR. HOOSE: The system for the lower grades would be called "oral" rather than otherwise.

DR. LYON: I am not particular what you call it at all. But so far as I know, and I have visited a good many schools, and do it every year of my life, I find both combined, and I find as miserable teachers as any one would want to see, in either department, and they give very poor instruction in either; but they go together. I never saw a child, in New England, of the age you speak of, that could not read a story and understand it,—learn from the book as well as from the teacher. I don't see how oral and written instruction can be divorced. They must go together, and it seems to me they always do. Certain leading characteristics may be affirmed of one or the other, but they certainly go together.

DR. HOOSE: To read a story is one thing, and to read a matter of scientific nicety is quite another. These children will read stories. They are very good, intelligent children. The schools are good schools. But to read a story is a very different thing from reading a mathematical problem or scientific statement. That is the thing I mean.

DR. LYON: I refer to what the gentleman said. He said a "simple narrative."

DR. HOOSE: A historical, close statement.

DR. LYON: "Simple narrative." I hold the gentleman to his words.

DR. LARKIN DUNTON: Mr. Chairman: I only want to say a word or two. It seems to me that if a child is properly instructed orally, so that he

gets his ideas and thoughts with perfect clearness, he ought then to be immediately so instructed that he can take up an ordinary text-book and allow the text-book to direct his observation, and to direct his thinking to the real objects and subjects of thought in the same way as the oral teacher would, and that when that is done,— when the child is prepared to take up the book and let the book take precisely the place of the living instructor, in that case it seems to me that it is rather distorting language to say that the knowledge which the pupil gets as a result of his own mental activities, under these circumstances, is the result of "oral instruction." It seems to me that that is exactly the point where the text-book comes in. And it seems to me that it is highly proper to call the one "oral" and to call the other "text-book," and that both the one and the other are important factors in good education.

DR. LYON: I think the last speaker has stated the thing just as it is. When you teach a child orally he will form the habit of getting thoughts from persons who teach him, and when he has done so he takes up the book and makes it seem the place of the living teacher, and "talks with the book." A child is not far advanced in knowledge until he can take instruction from the book and "talk with the book" as he would talk with his teacher.

MR. Z. RICHARDS, of Washington, D. C.: What is the object of the printed book, any way? What do we want printed books for? We want printed books as reservoirs of the knowledge that others have gained by their experience. If I can learn all things by objective teaching,

— by "oral teaching," — what do I want of books? The books are to be the store-houses of the knowledge which other people have gained. The text-books are to be the "*test*-books" of knowledge in the school. They are not only text-books, but "*test*-books." They are to be used by the teacher for the purpose of seeing whether that child can get knowledge out of books, the oral teaching, the object-teaching,— the objective teaching,— is to prepare the child to get knowledge out of the text-book, and, doing that, to get knowledge out of other books,— to get knowledge which he has never had an opportunity to gain for himself, — by his own observation or experience. Looking at the matter in that light, the error in teaching is just where Dr. Stone has placed it, or rather the difficulty in gaining knowledge which Dr. Hoose presented was the cause of the bad instruction. That child was not trained in a régime to get ideas, but to get words as the representatives of ideas, and he did not have the *test* of it in the text-book, as he ought to have had, and he consequently cannot take up another book and give the meaning of that book, because he has never been trained in it. Give us that kind of training, and you will never have any trouble about children gaining knowledge from books.

PROFESSOR DUNTON: If text-books are store-houses of knowledge gained by other people, and treasured up there, which our students have not gained for themselves, then is it the office of the text-book to put that matter in such a light that knowledge, somehow or other, will spring up in the minds of our children that they have

not got before; and if the text-book does that, is not that text-book teaching?

MR. RICHARDS: I want it to be distinctly understood that I use the word "text-book" as "*test*-book," — not as a means of receiving knowledge, but to show whether that child knows how to get knowledge out of that book and the books which he has to study afterwards. How to get knowledge out of books which he has never seen before will be understood by him, if he understands how to apply the knowledge he has already gained to the very text-books in the school.

MR. EDWARD DANFORTH, of Elmira, N. Y.: It seems to me that all proper "oral teaching" combines with it the exercise by the pupil of writing down, step by step in his progress, the work which he has accomplished; that no oral lesson is properly completed until the child is able to write down that lesson; that written and spoken language must become equally familiar to the child; and that the text-book which it is proper for that child to use is as simple and appropriate, in its lines, as the oral instruction which the teacher gives,— that they act conversely one to the other, and are only different forms of giving instruction,—and the child properly taught orally will obtain from the written lines, as readily as he will from the teacher, the thoughts intended to be conveyed. All proper oral teaching is connected with this exercise of writing down, and this ought to be carried on until the child becomes in the habit of writing down his ideas and the thoughts suggested by his lessons, as readily as of expressing them by spoken words. Then if the oral teaching is properly given, he will gain ideas as quickly and effectively from it

as from text-book instruction. Whatever is adduced to the contrary of this only shows a defect in "oral teaching."

DR. E. E. WHITE, President of Purden University of Indiana: Mr. Chairman:—I never hear my friend, Dr. Dickinson, on the subject of "oral teaching" without finding myself moved to thought, if not to speech; and the paper that he has read this morning, so admirably presenting to us the fundamental principles which underlie a method of oral teaching, seems to deserves a very careful consideration; and I rise, not to speak in the line of the discussion at this point, but rather to call attention again to the philosophy that underlies the paper. I ask whether oral teaching is exclusively analytic? I shall make no issue—and I would not speak a word if I thought any one would so understand me—with the paper on this point, but rather wish to look at it from my stand-point, to learn if I see it as Dr. Dickinson sees it. I have found that apparent differences between men are often the result of looking at the same subject from opposite sides; that they are but phases or parts of one truth; one emphasizes the one, and the other the other; and thus what we see is only an apparent antagonism.

Now I really cannot see—have never been able to see—the distinction which Dr. Dickinson makes between analysis and synthesis, as the basis of a method of "oral teaching," for I cannot see how the two methods or processes can be disjoined in teaching anything, the primary lesson as well as the more advanced exercise. We begin, he says, with "the whole," and then we analyze that "whole." Now do we analyze,

and confine our analysis to the "whole" with which we start? Do we not find elements in this "whole" which we had not in mind at all when we began the study of the "whole"? And then, before we know these elements as parts of a whole, must we not synthesize them and the known elements, and reach a new "whole"? Do not these two processes of analysis and synthesis go hand in hand, in every instance?

Take the illustration of "the state." The "state" which he brought before us as an object of thought was not the "state" with which the lesson ended. That which this word first represented had fewer elements, less contents, than that which the word represented when he was through. The same is true if we take a flower or a plant for a lesson. You may begin with the "whole." But if the lesson be properly taught, the plant which is in the mind of the child when the lesson terminates, is not the plant which was in its mind when the lesson began. It has been enriched and enlarged by synthesis. If we simply left the elements disjointed, without relation one to the other, we would not accomplish our purpose. But in our study we synthesize the elements we find by analysis of this "whole," and we have a new "whole," though not new in every particular. We have thus gained new knowledge of this object.

So as we emphasize the one of these processes or the other, our method of teaching will seem to be analytic or synthetic. The teacher who looks upon the analysis as the whole thing, and upon the synthesis as an incidental matter, will of course feel that he is teaching by analysis. On

the contrary, the teacher who has in mind the training of his pupils to the putting into right relations of these things that they have learned, making a right synthesis,—that aims to put in the mind an object of knowledge, with all the elements that have been found, each element in its proper relation, and who is careful to see that the act of synthesis is rightly performed, will believe, it may be, that he is teaching synthetically.

It seems to me, after all, that the difference between these two schools of primary teaching is not so great as is supposed; that when we come to take the two processes and unite them, we have a complete method, and they are thus united in all instruction. Now what bearing will this view have on a method of teaching? Let us see if it will not give a limit to "oral teaching," as defined in the paper. In "oral teaching," as thus defined, the object to be studied is presented to the mind. That object is then taught; and "oral teaching," as defined, would be limited to that knowledge which is found by an analysis of this object now present to the mind. Now what I feel to be true is, that this gives us a narrow basis, a narrow course of primary teaching,—because this analysis can only give us knowledge of this present object. Can we not teach this object in relation to objects not now present, which are absent from the mind, but which the pupil can comprehend through language, the terms employed representing real ideas that have been previously put in the mind; and thus the oral lesson broadens at once, and brings in knowledge outside of this object before the mind. And now when you carry this a little further you will see that, the

elements of knowledge being taught, the child can, not only from the teacher but also from the text-book, bring into this present "whole," by synthesis, facts which are outside of the analytic study of this "object"; and thus he obtains knowledge of the object before the mind, in its relation to other objects, not a part of that of which he has knowledge; and this broadens his study. He thus has a new "whole," a "whole" the parts of which were not all present, but all of which have relations to that which is present. It is true that we cannot see the relation of a thing present to a thing absent, unless the absent object is brought before the mind by terms, by language suggesting, at least, the other end of the relation; — and then we reach, it seems to me, new facts, and then a new "whole" is conceived. If I hold up a piece of quartz before the pupil, his knowledge of quartz is not limited to that specimen alone; the term "quartz" will represent to him something more than this piece; it will represent to him all that the lesson has brought in of its relations, not only of quartz, but of other rocks, no piece of which is present. And thus teaching goes out on the line of relations to objects not present, and if a knowledge of those objects can be brought into the mind by language the idea of which we are already familiar with, then we have wider knowledge.

Take history, for example. How can it be taught analytically? Of course we could not teach it at all unless we had some knowledge of the men who have played a part in it, — some knowledge of society. The elements are in man and society, as known; but how we run out on

the line of its relations to the history of the world, and thus teach it!

It seems to me that these two methods of analysis and of synthesis, thus presented, and the synthesis not confined, except in the mere primary processes, to the elements of the simple thing presented for study, will give us a broader system of primary teaching, which makes provision for the proper subordination of what is called "text-book instruction" to "oral teaching," and that the two united give us a philosophic and complete system of instruction.

Now I have said this on the "spur of the moment," and if I have said anything which conflicts with Dr. Dickinson's teaching, I hope he will charge it to the fact that the clear way in which he puts things has tempted me to speak on a subject of which I know very little, and it may be that it would be better if what I have said had been unsaid.

DR. DICKINSON: The points made by President White are so clearly put that I do not like to have the audience go away with the words he has uttered last in their ears. And it appears to me that the philosophy that he has unfolded here may be shown to be in fault. In the first place he spoke of going from a smaller to a larger "whole." Let us illustrate that. In the case of a plant the teacher may bring before his pupil a leaf. That is one part of the plant. But it is made, when it is brought before the pupil, to be his "whole." The plant as a whole is not the object of thought, and is not yet known. The very moment the whole leaf is brought before the pupil, the process the mind passes through is, first, that of *analysis*, by which the form of the thing is

known, the color of the thing found, etc., — by unloosing the qualities from one another, and thinking of the one apart from the others. And so of all the qualities. The first process was analysis, which consists in unloosing the qualities from one another. Then, after they are set apart, and the mind is able to think of them, it returns and puts them together, and forms the leaf;— and that is the *synthetic* act of the child. And as we begin by analysis, and learn what we can by that, and end with synthesis, that process is always called the analytic process, — the first being "the whole,"—the child descending from the "whole" to the parts, then returning and leaving the "whole" as he found it. Supposing the larger "whole" is to be presented, the whole plant may be brought before the pupil. Now that becomes his "whole"; and the same process that was followed before must be followed now, the pupil goes down, and by analysis finds the parts and elements of that thing, just as before. So whatever we take, we take first as a "whole," and the first process is analysis, and the final process is synthesis, which supplements the analytic process. Now he says the teacher is to teach the pupil to take these parts and combine them into a "whole." I said in my paper that there could be synthetic teaching as well as analytic. I can take the parts of a "whole," in the presence of my pupils, and I can put them together for them, and they can see me do it, and as I do it the relations the parts hold to one another can be known, — until finally that "whole" has been constructed by me. I desire to have the analysis and the synthesis done by the pupil himself,— because I bear in mind that

one of the principal objects to be gained in the exercise of the pupil is the training of his own powers, and they are trained by their own independent activity. Therefore I stand one side, and conduct my teaching in such a manner that the pupil can act for himself; and I secure independent activity by putting into the hands of the pupils the conditions necessary to enable them to act for themselves. I want to know by what possible process the pupils can know what the relations are which exist between the parts of a thing until they have seen those relations as they exist in the thing itself. If the parts of the human body have been taught, one by one, and put aside, and afterwards I call upon the pupil to construct these parts into a whole, and put these parts together, by what possible process can he do it? How does he know how one part is related to any other part? The relation which exists has never been seen. I said it was an impossible process, and it is; and the man who flatters himself that the pupil, unaided by his teacher, can construct the "whole," unguided by the relation the parts hold to one another, does not understand the philosophy of the human mind. We have to gain three kinds of knowledge in order to *know* a thing. We first see the whole; then we see the individual parts; then we see the relation which the parts hold to one another, there presented in that "whole." We may descend from the "whole," through the relations, to the parts; and as we look upon the parts they now become parts, because the relation that they hold is seen and observed.

Now by this descent from this "whole" to one of its parts, and seeing the relation it holds, I

can take one part off, view it by itself, put it back again, because the relation that part bears to other parts I saw in seeing the "whole." We must not flatter ourselves that the pupil can be led to perform these synthetic acts for himself, unless he has first seen the whole he is to construct, and by an analysis of his own has found the parts and their relations to one another. Let us put the thing to be known into his hands, and, simply directing him in his analysis and synthesis, leave him to do the work for himself. Then, as he goes out into life, he can have a method by which he can teach himself.

PRESIDENT WHITE: Let me detain Dr. Dickinson one moment longer. I think he must have misunderstood me. I did not mean to say that the teacher should begin with the parts and synthesize the whole, though this may be done in teaching certain topics.

DR. DICKINSON: How can he begin with analysis, unless the thing to be analyzed is in his presence?

PRESIDENT WHITE: The full thing or object cannot be in his presence in all cases.

DR. DICKINSON: The full thing, the "whole," must be in his presence.

PRESIDENT WHITE: The object with which we begin may be, but not the object with which the lesson ends.

DR. DICKINSON: In the case of an external thing, it is brought before him as a *thing*, but it is present to him as a state of mind. The attention is brought to bear upon it just as it was in the other case.

PRESIDENT WHITE: I will not debate that point further, but simply say that I do not wish

to be understood to hold that the teacher should try to make this synthesis for the pupil. When I am asked how the pupil can synthesize the elements which he has just found by analysis or study, into the "whole," I answer that he can do it by the same power of mind by which he can analyze a "whole" into its parts. The human mind is endowed with the power to put the parts of a thing together and construct a "whole."

DR. DICKINSON: If you mean that the pupil can put together parts that *he himself* has separated by analysis, then we do not differ, for this I have affirmed from the beginning of the discussion.

MR. COOPER: I would like to ask the doctor how he would bring the moon into the class-room? If we have "New York City," or "Africa," or the "History of Europe," as a topic of study, how is he going to bring those into the class-room?

DR. DICKINSON: It cannot be done. We never can know the moon as it is. That is perhaps unfortunate, and perhaps not. We have a good deal of study, that we are compelled to pursue in the schools, which leads us to know about things. To know about a thing is quite different from knowing the thing itself. If you should ever have the privilege of going to the moon, you would secure some new ideas that you never can obtain on this earth.

PRESIDENT MOWRY: I am sorry to have to abridge this discussion, but the time which we have to give to it at this session, is all consumed. You must not have it all at once. There is another session coming.

III.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

By John Tetlow, A. M., Principal Girls' Latin School, Boston, Mass.

IT is now about twenty-five years since the movement for securing to women the higher education given by colleges and universities began. Some of the difficulties which in the beginning seemed formidable have yielded to argument or to the progressive spirit of the age; others have been proved by experience to be imaginary; and some still remain to perplex and baffle us. It is my purpose in this paper to consider one comprehensive topic under each of these three heads, and I pass without introduction to the first. If I were to state it in the form of an affirmative proposition, I should say: The most efficient and the most beneficent service of woman in her proper sphere of activity is promoted by the higher education. As I have already intimated, this proposition compels assent not because it has been experimentally established — there has

not yet been time for that — but because the soundest reasoning and the progressive spirit of the age have arrayed themselves in its favor.

If I should trace the history of the relations of the sexes from the time when primitive man kidnapped or bought his wife and afterwards held her as his domestic drudge down to the present age, in which, in this country at least, woman, though not yet completely emancipated, is in most regards recognized as the equal of man, I should exhaust the time allotted me without so much as approaching the discussion of the topics I have proposed to myself. Such a review, however, would show that the popular idea as to what constitutes the legitimate sphere of female activity rests not solely on the natural functions and capacities of women, but on the inherited traditions of a time in which the superior physical strength of men was almost the only factor in determining the mutual relations of the sexes. Glance for a moment at some of the typical passages in ancient and mediæval literature, and see what virtues and what employments are emphasized in the portraitures of ideal women. The virtuous woman of the book of Proverbs, whose "price is above rubies," "layeth her hands to the spindle, and her hands hold the distaff; she seeketh wool and flax and worketh willingly with her hands; she riseth while it is yet night, and giveth meat to her household, and a portion to her maidens; with

the fruit of her hands she planteth a vineyard; she looketh well to the ways of her household, and eateth not the bread of idleness; she is not afraid of the snow for her household, for her household are clothed with scarlet; she maketh herself coverings of tapestry, her clothing is silk and purple." This, too, is the type of woman which the authors of the Homeric poems hold up to our admiration in Andromache and Penelope. The same type reappears in Livy's story of Lucretia, who receives the highest award of praise because she was found late at night spinning among her handmaids. In mediæval literature we have the patient Griselda, in whom wifely subjection reaches the point of meek and spiritless servility.

Now, it will at once be admitted that for the realization of the type of female perfection embodied in these delineations, a collegiate education is at least unnecessary. But, admitting that this type of female excellence is worth cultivating, is the higher education an impediment to its successful cultivation? Is there anything in sound learning that tends to dissipate the charms of social and domestic life? Is woman a less skillful manager of a household because she has thoroughly studied the chemical, physical, and vital laws that underlie cooking, cleaning, and the rearing of children? Is she a less trustworthy guide to the children whose education she will have to superintend,

because she has been made familiar with the laws of mental development and growth? Is she less helpful or less attractive to her husband because she has acquired an interest in the subjects which occupy his serious thought, and has gained the power of reasoning about them correctly? It would seem to be self-evident that these new acquisitions must add to the strength and attractiveness of every power with which nature has endowed her. But it is scarcely a score of years since it was seriously argued that the admission of women to university courses of study would unfit them for the duties which domestic and social life impose. There may be individuals, and doubtless are, who think so still, but they publish their thoughts less obtrusively than formerly, and their votes in educational councils grow fewer, and their voices feebler every year. The belief has gained strength and has become widely prevalent that there is a higher type of domestic affection than that founded on physical beauty, feminine blandishments, and household convenience; and that the participation of women in the privileges of university education fosters this higher type. I should hardly know where to look in literature for a more persuasive plea for the essentials of the higher education for women than is to be found in the second essay in Ruskin's *Sesame and Lilies*; and those who have read it, whatever be their attitude on the general ques-

tion here under consideration, will, I think, admit that it describes the finest type of female character known to our civilization. This essay contains such passages as these: "A woman may always help her husband by what she knows, however little; by what she half-knows or misknows, she will only tease him." Again: "If there were to be any difference between a girl's education and a boy's, I should say that of the two the girl should be earlier led, as her intellect ripens faster, into deep and serious subjects; and that her range of literature should be, not more, but less frivolous, calculated to add the qualities of patience and seriousness to her natural poignancy of thought and quickness of wit; and also to keep her in a lofty and pure element of thought." Again: "Not only in the material and in the course, but yet more earnestly in the spirit of it, let a girl's education be as serious as a boy's. You bring up your girls as if they were meant for sideboard ornaments, and then complain of their frivolity. Give them the same advantages that you give their brothers."

I have said that the opposition to the admission of women to university courses of instruction on the ground that participation in such courses would unfit them for their proper sphere of activity and would destroy the charm of domestic and social life, has yielded to argument and to the progressive spirit of the age. In leaving this

topic permit me to refer to a few statistics drawn from widely different sources in support of this statement.

Before 1873 there was no institution in the State of Massachusetts that gave to women such facilities for the higher education as were offered to men in the colleges of the state. Since that time, two colleges for the separate education of women have been organized, and are in successful operation: Smith College in Northampton and Wellesley College in Wellesley. The first of these has at present 265 students, the second 450. A third institution, the College of Liberal Arts of Boston University, organized in 1873, admits men and women on equal terms, and has at present 37 female students. The so-called Annex at Cambridge, organized in 1879, now numbers 42 students. Until the year 1878, there was no public school in the city of Boston at which girls could receive the preparatory training required for admission to these colleges. In that year the Girls' Latin School was organized; and, although from one-fourth to one-third of those applying for admission have been rejected on examination, the school has increased in numbers during the four years of its existence from 28 to 145. This is the statistical record of a single state. The same movement was inaugurated in England, about twenty-five years ago, by the establishment of Queen's College for women.

Since 1878, its graduates have been admitted to degrees in London University on the same terms as the graduates of the colleges for men connected with the same university. Some years ago, University College, which is the immediate dependant of London University, began to admit women as students, at first in separate classes. After a brief experience the policy of separation was abandoned on economical grounds, and students of both sexes have since been instructed in the same classes. The total number of the students enrolled under the faculties of Arts, Laws, and Science, in this college, in 1881, was 789; and of this number, 262 were women. In 1869 a college for women was established at Girton, a small parish near Cambridge, having an unofficial connection with the University of Cambridge similar to that existing between the so-called Annex and Harvard College. In 1879 the number of students in residence was 42. In 1875 Newnham Hall was opened within the territorial limits of the university itself, having accommodations for thirty students and was soon filled to overflowing. In 1878 an association for the promotion of the university education of women was formed at Oxford, and two halls have since been opened for women. At present, the students resident in these halls are admitted to a limited number of university courses. The success of Girton and Newnham colleges produced a deep impression

in England, not only in the country at large, but especially in the conservative educational centres. In 1880 petitions numerously signed, and compelling attention still more by the weight than by the number of the signatures, were presented to the senate of the University of Cambridge, praying for the enlargement of university privileges for women. The committee to whom the subject was referred reported substantially in favor of admitting women on equal terms to the university tests of proficiency established for men, and the recommendation of the committee was adopted by the senate, by a vote of more than ten to one. It is hardly necessary for me to go farther in search of evidence of the fact that public sentiment no longer deems the university education of women detrimental to the interests of society.

But, admitting that the higher education does not necessarily involve any sacrifice of the charms of social and domestic life, what is to be said of the capacity of women to receive it? When it was first proposed to extend to women the same facilities for collegiate education that men enjoy, the objection was seriously made that the female mind, so called, was deficient in the logical faculty, and incapable of severe and protracted effort in any direction. Women are quick, it was admitted, often brilliant; but after all, shallow, you know. George Eliot, in the *Mill on the Floss*, in a quiet vein of conscious satire, puts

this objection into the mouth of Mr. Stelling, Tom Tulliver's tutor. "Maggie told Tom she should like to go to school to Mr. Stelling, as he did, and learn just the same things. She knew she could do Euclid. 'I'm sure you couldn't, now,' said Tom; 'and I'll just ask Mr. Stelling if you could.' 'I don't mind,' said the little conceited minx. 'I'll ask him myself.' 'Mr. Stelling,' she said that same evening when they were in the drawing-room, 'couldn't I do Euclid, and all Tom's lessons, if you were to teach me instead of him?' 'No, you couldn't,' said Tom indignantly, 'girls can't do Euclid; can they Sir?' 'They can pick up a little of everything, I dare say,' said Mr. Stelling. 'They have a good deal of superficial cleverness; but they couldn't go far into anything. They're quick and shallow.'" Thousands of teachers in mixed secondary schools could testify that girls under their instruction had studied with boys in the same classes, and had not only held their own in tests of scholarship, but had as often surpassed the boys as they had been surpassed by them. The obvious and correct answer to this testimony was, that success in elementary subjects does not necessarily imply success in advanced subjects. It does not follow that the student who has had no difficulty with arithmetic, elementary algebra, and plane geometry, will also master with ease the conic sections, descriptive geometry, the cal-

culus, and quaternions. There was nothing in the experience of teachers in mixed secondary schools to show that girls who could learn to play the piano with facile execution, and to chatter French with volubility, would be able to grasp the subtleties of metaphysics, or thread the intricacies of a Greek tragic chorus. In vindication of this skepticism as to the strength and endurance of the mental powers of women, it was pointed out that most, if not all, the original thinkers, even in the departments most cultivated by women, were men. For example, more girls study music and painting than boys; but the great masters of musical composition and the leaders of schools of art have been men. Again, girls are more susceptible to the charms of poetry than boys, and read it more diligently; but the Shakespeares, Miltons, Goethes and Dantes of literature are men. So, too, the leading historians, philosophers and inventors have all been men. Indeed, while it might naturally have been expected that men would be the inventors of the steam-engine, the telegraph, and the rifle, what is to be said of the fact that men invented the sewing machine, the clothes-wringer, and the carpet-sweeper? Again, it might with reason have been anticipated that men, who are the miners and navigators, should originate such sciences as geology and astronomy; but why should not a woman have developed systematic botany?

The obvious, though possibly not the conclusive, answer to all these questions is, that women have been persistently shut out from the studies and occupations by which men have been trained and equipped for original work. Mill argues this question in his essay on the "Subjection of Women" with his accustomed force, and contends that, with the same advantages of position and training, women would compete successfully with men in all departments. We may at least claim as much as this: that a historical study of the advancement of the arts and sciences, pursued side by side with a historical study of the social position occupied by women during the progress of civilization, will not justify the assumption that the relative superiority of men to women in the departments here considered is an evidence of greater original intellectual power; nor will it warrant the belief that, under changed conditions, this relative superiority will always continue.

When, indeed, public sentiment shall have secured to women the same educational opportunities offered to men, and shall have encouraged women to avail themselves of these opportunities by the stimulus of unrestricted admission to the various professions for which a liberal education, supplemented by professional training, is the recognized qualification, it is by no means improbable that women will be found who will

take the same position among the original workers in science, medicine, law, history, philosophy, which George Eliot has achieved in fiction, Rosa Bonheur in art, and Elizabeth Barrett Browning in poetry.

But in the midst of these discussions as to the relative capacity of men and women for intellectual work of a high order, practical experiments have been in progress, and sufficient time has already elapsed since they were initiated to enable us to utilize the results in the formation of a judgment. Let us glance for a moment at the testimony of those who have conducted these experiments. Girton College, as I have already said, went into operation in 1869. From the opening of the college to June, 1879, eighty-six students had been admitted, of whom forty-two remained in residence during the ensuing year. Of the remaining forty-four, nineteen had obtained honors according to the university standard: six in classics, five in mathematics, four in natural sciences, three in moral sciences, and one in history; and eleven had passed the examinations which qualify for the degree of Bachelor of Arts. Newnham Hall, accommodating thirty students, was opened in 1875. The principal of the college, writing to President Barnard, of Columbia College, in 1880, says: "Eighteen of our students have come out in honor, and there have been four first classes in this number, and

eight second classes." At University College, London, one-third of the 789 students enrolled under the faculties of arts, laws, and sciences, are women; and in the examinations for honors, according to the published reports, these have been successful in securing a fair proportion. The so-called Annex at Cambridge, Mass., began to receive students in 1879. According to a detailed statement of the secretary, made in my hearing a little more than a year afterwards, the average marks of the women in attendance on the collegiate courses were considerably higher than those of the young men in the college pursuing the same studies and subjected to identical tests. President Angell, of Michigan University, speaking in his report for 1872 of the young women connected with that university, says: "They have addressed themselves to their work with great zeal, and have shown themselves quite capable of meeting the demands of severe studies as successfully as their classmates of the other sex. Their work so far does not evince less variety of aptitude or less power of grappling even with higher mathematics than we find in the young men. They receive no favors, and desire none. They are subjected to precisely the same tests as the men." In his report of the next year, he says: "The history of our work during the past year has only deepened the impression made during the two previous years, of

the entire practicability of imparting collegiate and professional education to the two sexes in the same schools."

It would be easy to add pages of testimony from other sources in support of the statement that there is no appreciable difference of natural aptitude for the higher studies in the two sexes; but, in view of the fact that the testimony of all who have become qualified by actual observation or experiment to form an intelligent opinion is uniform on this point, it is needless to extend this appeal to testimony. Now, after making due allowance for the exceptional ability which may be thought to have characterized the women who, in the earlier stages of this movement, have fought their way through obstacles to recognition in university courses of study, we are at least justified in claiming as much as this: that alleged intellectual inferiority can no longer be urged as a legitimate ground for denying to women the privileges of collegiate education. That the proportion of women who shall hereafter achieve conspicuous success in the highest departments of intellectual activity will be as great as that of men, is, perhaps, in view of the natural law that women become mothers, and as such create and preside over homes, not to be expected; but that there will be a sufficient number of such women appreciably to raise the standard of acceptable work in these departments, is altogether probable.

With this phase of the subject, those other subordinate questions, as co-education, woman suffrage, etc., have at present but few points of contact. The higher education must be provided for women, and accepted by them quite without reference to its possible results. Few men before the war would have listened calmly to any proposition contemplating the immediate and general liberation of slaves; but there came a time when such a step was so obviously necessary to the preservation of the Union, that it was taken with universal acquiescence. In like manner, whenever it shall appear that the most economical, and the most practically feasible way of extending to women the same educational advantages that men enjoy, is to place them in the same classes, under the same instructors; then co-education, in the only sense in which it is worth establishing, will establish itself. Those who are wise do not plead for co-education as such, they ask for equality of educational privileges only. In the same way, if the counsel and coöperation of thoughtful and well-trained women comes to be needed in the solution of political and social problems, let us for the sake of the state and society, not in the spirit of a fanatical crusade for women's rights, impose upon women the responsibility of complete citizenship. So, too, in the various professions, let us get the best work done that our race is capable of doing. If, un-

der our present social economy, we practically deprive ourselves of a considerable proportion of the best brain work at our command, by all means let us reform our social economy. All the higher departments of human activity are burdened with mediocrity. If thoroughly trained women will step in to raise the standard, let us for the welfare of society welcome their coöperation.

But a third and more serious objection has been made to the extension of collegiate instruction to women. It has been said that women are physically incapable of enduring the strain of protracted mental labor; that they are burdened with certain physiological functions from which they cannot escape, even if escape were desirable; and that the attempt to combine with these the severe intellectual labor demanded by a university course of study, must result in physical or intellectual failure, perhaps in both. The wide discussion elicited by the publication of Dr. Clark's essay, called *Sex in Education*, about ten years ago, must still be fresh in the minds of all. The theory of that essay, briefly stated, was this: Two intense nervous actions cannot, without detriment, be simultaneously sustained by the same organization. The mental labor demanded by school studies, on the one hand, and the physical tension incident to certain physiological processes peculiar to women, on the other, each involve intense nervous action. They are, therefore, incompati-

ble with each other. The position taken by Dr. Clark was vigorously, and, as it seems to me, successfully assailed in a collection of essays written by several ladies engaged in educational or medical work, and published under the editorial supervision of Miss Brackett, in 1874. The most convincing of these essays, to my mind, was that of Dr. Mary Putnam Jacobi. The writer, amply qualified by professional study, clinical experience, and personal familiarity with the female organism, met the essayest on his own ground, and showed the falsity, or, perhaps I should say, the incompleteness of his reasoning. I could not, in this paper, even if I were competent to do so, discuss satisfactorily the physiological aspects of this question, and I must content myself with having merely mentioned an accessible book in which they are worthily treated.

But, apart from medical opinion, which, as having a flavor of professional bias, practical teachers are perhaps more inclined to resent than they should be, what has been the observation of those who have watched the work of women in the higher institutions that have already been opened to them? President Seelye, of Smith College, Northampton, writing in September, 1880, after five years' experience, says: "I am now entirely convinced that women can pursue a course of liberal education, not only without physical injury, but with increasing health and

strength." A private letter from a student in the same college, written last March, contains the following: "As for the health of the girls, it seems to me to average about the same as that of any other two hundred whom one could pick out. Of course, a few break down from overwork, but their number is small, and it is their own fault, for every precaution is taken here to avoid everything of the kind, and I sometimes think that the principal object of the Faculty seems to be to keep us back. Ever so many girls get better here, and those who leave are usually those who would be just as likely to break down if they had led the life of most girls who stay at home." This testimony, coming from two distinct sources, and mutually corroborative, should, it would seem, be considered final with regard to the institution to which it refers. I might easily quote similar statements from those connected with other higher institutions open to women; but, inasmuch as such testimony, so far as it has come under my observation, is substantially uniform, I shall allow this single example to suffice. So far, then, as the higher institutions for women are concerned, it is perhaps not too much to say that argument founded on physiological considerations, and the actual experience of cautious observers, have demonstrated that the collegiate education of women is entirely compatible with the maintenance of physical health.

But there is another side. The colleges and universities receive their students at the age of eighteen, when the physiological crisis is past. They receive those only who, in obedience to the law of the survival of the fittest, have passed the critical period in safety. Released, moreover, from the necessity of training their students to pass a final examination for admission to a still higher institution, they may trim their courses of study down to the safety point, and, by compulsory physical exercises in well-equipped gymnasiums, may furnish a substitute for exercise in the open air, which, with growing girls, is essential to health, but which parents do not insist upon, and which girls, when left to themselves, do not take. The secondary schools, on the other hand, receive their pupils when the physiological change is beginning, and in most cases do not directly control their occupations out of school hours. The requirements of the college, the expectation of the parents, the ambition of the pupil, and perhaps at present, the over-stimulated desire of the teacher to demonstrate that girls, in spite of physical obstacles, can accomplish as much as boys, all demand that a fixed standard of attainment shall be reached at a given time. Now it is to this period that my personal experience in the education of girls relates, and when, after consenting to prepare the present paper, I began to cast about for a topic on which

that experience might give me a claim to speak, I found that my thoughts were constantly recurring to the physical difficulties that teachers in my position have to meet. I confess that I am sometimes sorely perplexed by them. I have no misgiving whatever about the intellectual capacity of girls; I have none about the physical endurance of the majority; if girls lived as boys live, I should have no misgiving about the physical endurance of girls as a whole. But as things are, the thorough preparation of delicately organized girls for college, within the same limits as to time that experience has shown to be safe for average boys, is attended with no slight difficulties. Permit me, in connection with this subject, to call your attention to some statistics, published by Mr. Seaver, superintendent of the Boston public schools, in his last annual report. He says:

"In each of the upper classes [of the grammar schools] it is found that the elder portion of the class contains more girls than boys, while the younger portion contains more boys than girls. For example, in the third class of the grammar schools we find:

Pupils of thirteen years, or less:	Boys,	1,215
	Girls,	962
Pupils of fourteen years, or more:	Boys,	631
	Girls,	752

In the first class of the grammar schools we find:

Pupils of fourteen years, or less: { Boys, 294 / Girls, 205

Pupils of fifteen years, or more: { Boys, 408 / Girls, 620

A similar contrast is found in all the classes of the high schools. It should be remembered that the numbers here contrasted are totals drawn from all the schools of the city. The disparity would be even more striking, if schools showing opposite tendencies, in respect to the ages and grading of their pupils, were selected and contrasted. Thus, in the first class of certain grammar schools, selecting three boys' and three girls' schools, we find:

Pupils of fourteen years, or less: { Boys, 57 / Girls, 11

Pupils of fifteen years, or more: { Boys, 54 / Girls, 102"

Now among the generally prevalent beliefs respecting the characteristic differences between boys and girls, is this: That the intellect of girls ripens faster than that of boys. If this be true, why is it that we find older girls and younger boys at the same stage of progress in all the grammar and high schools of the city of Boston. The interpretation which, in the light of experience, I am constrained to put upon these statistics, is that the girls advance more slowly because

they are more frequently and for a longer time than boys interrupted in their attendance at school, and that this greater interruption is largely due to their relatively inferior physical endurance. Now is this relatively inferior physical endurance attributable to the physiological impediment which nature has placed in their way? Partially, perhaps, but not wholly. It is largely attributable to their different mode of life. There is an age at which girls and boys can scarcely be distinguished except by difference of dress. On looking out of the window the other day, I was somewhat surprised to see my little five-year-old daughter actually wrestling with a six-year-old playmate of the other sex. Animated by the prevailing orthodox instinct of horror at such a hoydenish propensity, I rapped on the window just in time to rescue the little fellow from an ignominious fall, and my little girl had to seek in-doors a more feminine, though perhaps less congenial, occupation. Up to the age of thirteen or fourteen, girls will romp if they are allowed to; but at this age, partly in obedience to a newly developing self-consciousness, but more in obedience to what the prescriptions of society demand of them, their romping ceases. At the age when boys are becoming conscious of their increasing physical powers, and are devoting themselves with zest to out-of-door sports which call these physical powers into vigorous exercise, girls are

encouraged to hold these natural impulses in check, and to impose upon themselves prematurely the restraints of an artificial propriety. If they now do what their brothers are applauded for doing, they are pronounced rude and boisterous. Instead of devoting their leisure to invigorating sports in the open air, the effect of which would be not to destroy a becoming maidenly reserve, but rather to heighten its charm, they must add to their school tasks prolonged daily practice at the piano, and must take intermittent lessons in dancing and deportment. The boys take naturally to boating, fishing, hunting, foot-ball, base-ball; the girls bend over fancy needle-work and embroidery. An extract from Spencer's *Essay on Education* will be recognized as a not greatly exaggerated description of a difference between the physical education of boys and girls, that is as prevalent in this country as in England. He says:

"We have both a boys' and a girls' school within view; and the contrast between them is remarkable. In the one case, nearly the whole of a large garden is turned into an open, graveled space, affording ample scope for games, and supplied with poles and horizontal bars for gymnastic exercises. Every day, before breakfast, again towards eleven o'clock, again at mid-day, again in the afternoon, and once more after school is over, the neighborhood is awakened by a chorus

of shouts and laughter, as the boys rush out to play; and for as long as they remain, both eyes and ears give proof that they are absorbed in that enjoyable activity which makes the pulse bound and ensures the healthful activity of every organ. How unlike is the picture offered by the 'Establishment for Young Ladies'! Until the fact was pointed out, we actually did not know that we had a girls' school as close to us as the school for boys. The garden, equally large with the other, affords no sign whatever of any provision for juvenile recreation; but is entirely laid out with prim grass-plots, gravel-walks, shrubs, and flowers, after the usual suburban style. During five months we have not once had our attention drawn to the premises by a shout or a laugh. Occasionally girls may be observed sauntering along the paths with their lesson-books in their hands, or else walking arm-in-arm. Once, indeed, we saw one chase another round the garden; but, with this exception, nothing like vigorous exertion has been visible."

The thought that I wish especially to emphasize, then, is this: The success of the efforts now making in behalf of the higher education of women will be determined by the success with which we deal with the problem in its physical aspects. And here it will not do for us to neglect the foundation, and confine our attention to the superstructure. We must begin at the bot-

tom, not at the top. The physical education of the girls who are preparing for college is even more important and should receive even more serious and persistent attention than that of the young women already admitted to college. Let me read you just here a bit of fresh and genuine testimony to the value of systematic physical exercise. It is from a private letter written to a friend by a student at Smith College: "After tea, we have reading aloud in the parlor for half an hour, and then it is time to dress for gymnastics, which come at half-past seven." I beg you to note the expression "*dress* for gymnastics." More than half the girls in our secondary schools dress in such a way that really vigorous physical exercise is impossible. "These physical exercises in the gymnasium," the writer continues, "are a perfect blessing to the girls, I think. Many a night I go to them all hot and headachy, and feeling that I can hardly stand up, and come away as bright and fresh as possible after an hour's hard exercise. The girls grumble a good deal at having to take the time for them, but I know that, for my part, it doesn't do to cut. I've tried it often enough, and invariably I lie awake until one or two o'clock in consequence."

Now measured movements taken ten or fifteen minutes a day to the accompaniment of the piano, which is about the extent to which systematic physical exercises devised for girls in second-

ary schools have thus far been carried, are worth something; but they do not suffice. Such exercises easily become mechanical and monotonous. The girls who most need physical exercise go through these movements most languidly, and at best they take them in-doors. Physical exercise to be profitable must be pleasurable, and must be taken in the open air. We have in this country, through the elasticity of our social life and free institutions, already made it possible for girls and women to go where they please without a male attendant to protect them from insult. We must go farther. We must accustom ourselves to greater latitude on the part of girls in out-of-door sports. We did not use to allow them to skate, but we have long since permitted them to enjoy this exhilarating exercise, and that, too, without in the least impairing feminine grace or refinement. Lawn tennis and archery, too, have recently become popular for girls. Why not carry forward the movement for dress-reform, and make other out-of-door sports possible and pleasurable. If girls are to be held to the performance of the same intellectual tasks as boys, they must live as boys live. Until we establish physical freedom in its purest and best sense for our girls, it is in vain to hope that our efforts to establish intellectual freedom will be anything but abortive. Let us here take counsel of the poet Wordsworth:

"Three years she grew in sun and shower,
Then *Nature* said, a lovelier flower
On earth was never sown.
This child I to myself will take;
She shall be mine, and I will make
A lady of my own.

Myself will to my darling be
Both law and impulse; and with me
The girl, in rock and plain,
In earth and heaven, in glade and bower,
Shall feel an overseeing power
To kindle, or restrain.

The floating clouds their state shall lend
To her, for her the willow bend;
Nor shall she fail to see
Even in the motions of the storm,
Grace that shall mould the maiden form
By silent sympathy."

DISCUSSION.

MR. ELLIS, Superintendent of Schools at Rochester, N. Y., cited examples of young ladies of his acquaintance, who had passed through a hard and severe course of collegiate instruction, and were physically stronger and healthier than when they commenced it. He believed firmly that our girls were fully equal to the work of college training, so far as the tax upon the physical system was concerned, especially if during their earlier years they had given sufficient attention to physical exercise.

DR. JOHN HANCOCK, of Ohio: I apprehend there is no question in the mind of any educator here that girls are entirely competent to take a collegiate course, and in almost all the Western

colleges the girls and boys are now taught together in the same institution. It is a question that is not entirely settled, as it seems to me, whether this is the most profitable way to educate the two sexes, *i. e.*, whether the girls can take as hard work as the young men, and work in the same classes with them, without one of two things happening, — either that the girls are overworked physically, or that the boys have not work enough to do. My own view is that, as a rule, boys in college and elsewhere are not worked sufficiently hard. I believe the salvation of a boy depends upon his being worked "to the top of his bent," both physically and intellectually. I am convinced that this can be done without any injury, if the intellectual and physical exercises are properly blended together. I believe the time is coming when our girls will take more physical exercise, and when they will be, in some sense at least, worthy and equal coworkers with their brothers in this field of collegiate study.

Rev. James Tufts, of Monson, Ind.: I would like to know what is to become of the bright boys.

Dr. Hancock: That is one of the questions that I have been striving, in my humble way, to solve. The bright boys need more to do. I believe no school curriculum is complete that does not give the bright boys a special list of studies.

President Marvin, of the University of Kansas: The best way to keep the bright boys busy in their college work, is to put some bright girls in the same classes with them. We have just such boys and girls in Kansas. During the last seven years, we have each year graduated,

side by side, Bachelors of Arts and Bachelors of Science, young men and young women. The boys and girls of our schools recite side by side. The young women do not lose their womanhood, and the young men are better men for the drill they receive in this companionship. I simply desire to emphasize the doctrines taught in the paper just read, and to say that they are capable of the widest application in co-education.

Dr. W. W. Folwell, President of the University of Minnesota: While gentlemen are arguing the question as to whether young women can be taught in colleges with young men, I beg to have it remembered that Oberlin has been doing the thing for thirty years, and that fifty or more institutions in the West and Northwest have been doing it from the beginning. What you are speculating about has already been done. Let me say to you that the thing is settled.

Mr. Morris, of Brooklyn: The West is constantly setting the example for the East. The principal of a large school in Ohio said to me once: "Of all the girls and boys I have had in school, I have never had a bright boy that I could not find a bright girl to match him."

Mr. Z. Richards, of Washington: The difficulty about girls engaging in the same collegiate studies with boys, is not an intellectual difficulty; it is physical mainly. Girls are not trained physically as they ought to be. Give them the proper physical training in childhood, and from their childhood up, and you will find that they will be able to endure the same studies as men. What is wanted is to begin at the very lowest schools and train the girls and boys intellectually and physically together. They will then go right

along, side by side, with scarcely a difference to be perceived in the progress which they respectively make.

Miss Arnold, of Syracuse: The teachers of the lowest schools should instruct the young girls in physical exercises. We should also strive to interest their mothers in this subject. I am teacher of a high school, and I observe that the girls come to me in very feeble health. The need is for physical training to come in early in life,—with the mothers, before the school is reached. The daughters must do physical work at home. That is the way I was treated, and I have never had a sick day in my life. I have brought the matter to the attention of mothers in Syracuse, and have received their thanks for doing so. Home is the place for physical training.

IV.

MORAL TEACHING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

By Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer, Florence, Mass.

THE following is a brief abstract of Mrs. Spencer's address:

In dealing with this question, three points must be discussed, viz.:

1st. The need for an increase in moral direction and control in American life.

2d. The portion of such moral direction and control which the state may legitimately assume, and is in duty bound so to do, in public education.

3d. The methods by which this state moral direction and control may be best applied in our common schools.

In testing the moral condition of our country we must ask first how perfectly is the generally accepted standard of right living exemplified in the average individual life? And next we must inquire how perfectly is moral growth facilitated by general devotion to the improvement of that

accepted standard of right living? The perfect moral condition demands implicit obedience to the known right, and constant study of character and condition to increase this knowledge of the right. The personal disobedience to the acknowledged duty gives us bad character. The general indifference to the yet undiscovered duties gives us bad conditions, which react upon the personal character to still further debase it. The bad character indicates a lack of control in education, as well as deficiencies in inheritance and environment. The indifference to bad conditions shows a lack of clear direction in the moral forces of society as truly as it indicates defects in personal development.

Moral *control* has to do with the strengthening of the individual conscience for its work of sovereign command. Moral *direction* has to do with the training of conscience to the point where its commands shall be always in accordance with the clearest apprehension of ethical principles and their latest application. The alarming increase of juvenile crime in America during the last thirty years; the apparently increasing tendency of our most fortunate youth to rudeness, loud manners in public places, and utter disregard of others' comfort; the wide-spread dislike to serious application, and the desire to gain superficial rather than real advantages of study and life; these all indicate a lack of moral control in

American education. The dishonesty of tradesmen and manufacturers; the sacrifice of the public welfare to the personal or party gain of the politician, or the selfish shirking of the more able and scrupulous; the vice that flourishes in society outwardly respectable; these things show too often among men the mature fruit of a child-training which fails to fix the habit of control of the higher over the lower elements of desire. And among women the same result is shown, as often, perhaps, by their willingness to condone all moral offenses of men, provided they are given a generous share of the gains in money, social position, or ease, which accrue from wrong-doing. These men and women alike prove our deficiency in character. And large numbers of good men and women, who seek habitually to live up to their conception of right, obstruct moral growth by opposing every new application of accepted principles, every reform which seeks to make the conditions of society more favorable to personal right-doing; and these show our deficiency in moral perception.

Admitting our need for increased control and direction in ethics, what (to consider the second point of the discussion) is the state right and duty in relation to this moral element of education? The state right and duty in this regard is defined and limited by the demands of citizenship which the state makes upon the individual.

The first basis of free education by the state is the general need for intelligent citizenship, and the fact that that need is met more fully and surely by public tax than by private provisions. Some measure of compulsory education is the corollary of the tax-supported school. The education which the state obliges all to pay for and receive must be education in the essential elements of good citizenship. The foundation principle of our democratic state is the largest measure of personal liberty consistent with social order. This forbids the compulsory training of children in allegiance or opposition to any form of religion, since the statute law protects each citizen in his rights of private judgment. Theists, atheists, Jews, Christians, Buddhists, and agnostics have equal rights in the state and in state schools. Whatever, therefore, remains of religious observance in the opening prayer, or reading of the Hebrew or Christian Scripture, or in attempted bias of the child's mind toward any one religion as superior to all others, must in justice be expunged.

Whatever, also, in the details of ethics, the specialties of conduct, is still undecided by the general will, not yet worked into accepted law and still in the seething conflict of opinion which characterizes the progress of a moral reform, must be omitted from the compulsory teaching of children coming from varied home influences.

All that relates to speculative dogmas of faith in an ideal perfection and man's relation to it, all that relates to the philosophic aspect of morals, the genesis of the moral law, the essence of conscience; all that relates to the developing, but not yet fully defined standard of ethics, all must be left to the untrammeled and subtle inflences of religious instruction and moral reform. The state's more clumsy hand must limit its restraint to the stated principles of its political creed and their application as already defined by law. The spirit of fraternal association, of equality of rights, of freedom of opportunity, of carefully adjusted balance between the personal will and the general good, these, its own foundations, the state must place securely beneath the character of its citizens. Its history, its special function, its methods of government, its requirements from the individual, its details of law, these it is in duty bound to teach the ignorant, that they may learn their political duty. The moral teaching which the state must give in greater measure is that which pertains to the obligation of the individual to the state, the consecration of the personal life to the public well-being, and the practical steps of conduct by which that object may be attained.

What methods shall the state use in furnishing this, its quota of moral influence, in the development of character?

Since increasing civilization increases, with

the growing complexity of human relations, the complexity of ethical problems, and since our form of government puts the burden of ethical decisions of great difficulty upon the less educated and hardest worked classes, the state must devote itself *first* and *chiefly* to the classes most needing instruction. The best instruction for the greatest number. The wisest training for the youngest child. These must be the watch-words of all educational reform. And the greatest need in moral teaching is that the popular theory of education be reversed, and that the chief anxiety, the most generous expenditure of money and effort, the most thoroughly trained and highly respected teachers be consecrated to the youngest children, and to those who will receive the benefits of the public school the shortest time. The kindergarten, with its practical, concrete personal training in that liberty under law, that fraternal association of equals, which is the American idea, must be the earliest state school, beginning its induction into social duties as early as the third year. Then the schools above must be shaped to the kindergarten idea of a trinity of employments:—of the mind; of the hand and its attendant senses; of the heart in supervised play, or voluntary action conformed to the law of co-operation.

In carefully directed work the child learns the necessity of thoroughness, of honesty, of the

harmonious relation of part to part, which is a moral lesson of supreme value. In carefully directed play the child learns, as in no other way, the unity of human interests, the fundamental principle of ethics, that good for one is good for all, and that the selfishness that would be blest alone defeats its end utterly. We urge then, that the moral influence of work and play, under the wisest and best guidance, be added to the mental stimulus, and all applied in the concrete experience of kindergartens and primary schools, dominated by the spirit of liberty under law, independence, and coöperation which Froebel taught. Young children cannot be taught by abstract precepts or didactic methods. The living, vital experience must teach them as it has taught the race, and study, work, and play in public school, constantly shaped to the one end of ensuring a habit of action which shall preserve a just balance of self-rights and other self-duties, would go far toward developing the kind of citizenship the state demands.

Later on, the influence of biographical history, of the great men and women who have emphasized the great events, and the more specific drill in laws and the details of political action, may be added to help the growing youth to more conscious and intelligent devotion to the well-being of society.

In these ways the external virtues of life may be taught by the state without outraging any man's conscience or stimulating any social antagonism. And within this outer circle of instruction, the more interior religious, reformatory, and parental elements of education may better work their deeper work of character-culture.

V.

TEMPERANCE FOR THE YOUNG.

By John B. Gough, Esq., of Worcester, Mass.

MR. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: When I consider the character and importance of this assembly, I begin to fear that your respected president and my friend has been a little injudicious in inviting me to speak, and that I have been a little lacking in modesty in accepting his invitation. But as I am here to-night to speak to you on this one theme of "Temperance in Reference to the Young," I will do the best I can to interest my audience in that theme. And I don't intend to utter to you the commonplaces that "as the twig is bent, the tree is inclined," and that "prevention is better than cure"; but I wish to say to this audience that drunkenness is an evil that the mind of man is not capable of comprehending in its full extent, and that drunkenness would die out with the present race of the intemperate if there were no more drunkards made. And I

hold that the greatest work we can do is to build the barrier as high as heaven between the unpolluted lip of the children and the intoxicating cup.

I don't make these assertions without being ready to give reasons for them. I am not here to dictate to you what to do. That is not my province. I have no executive ability; and if you should put me at the head of an institution I should "run it into the ground" in six months. I cannot tell you what to do; but if in the short space of time allotted for this address I can inspire you with some zeal and desire to do, and to find out some way to do, I shall be perfectly satisfied.

Our definition of temperance differs perhaps, from yours. I have been told that it is a misnomer for me to call myself "a temperance man." They say "*we* are temperance men, and *you* are a total abstainer." My definition of temperance is this: "Temperance is a lawful gratification of a natural appetite." I think that is a true definition, "a lawful gratification of a natural appetite." Is the appetite for intoxicating liquor a natural one? No, no. No man was ever born with an appetite for intoxicating stimulant, unless of hereditary tendency, where the sentence is carried out that the sins of the fathers shall be visited upon the children. There *are* such cases;—God help us, there are such

cases. A minister of the gospel wrote me a short time ago (excuse me if in this lecture I deal exclusively in facts. They say I have no argument, no logic. I draw my argument from facts,—illustrate my argument by facts; so it is pretty much all facts); this gentleman wrote me a letter in which he said: "My grandfather died of *delirium tremens*. My mother was a drinking woman to the day of her death. I have a natural tendency to the use of intoxicating liquor. When I was ten years of age I drank cider, and it made me crazy, and I always wanted more. I made up my mind that I never would touch the intoxicating cup. I became a minister; was ordained; chose the hardest work I could do; was in Texas ten years. While I was busy at work I was held right; but since I have been broken down and unable to work I have been sorely tempted. I have covered every day of my life with prayer. I have abstained from animal food; have spent hundreds of dollars out of my poor salary at water-cure establishments, trying to wash this devil out of me. And yet, sir, I tremble every day on the awful verge of indulgence. What can I do? Is there any hope for me this side of the grave?" I could not tell him there was any hope for him; only he must fight. And I said it was a grand sight, to see a man battling an evil tendency, battling a hereditary desire; that it was a fight

on which the very angels looked with complacency, and in which Christ himself sympathized with him. And I wished him "God speed" in his fight, though I could give him no hope that his appetite could be cured.

This is, perhaps, a digression. But only in such cases as this is there a natural tendency or disposition to drink, any more than there is a natural tendency to the use of tobacco; if you never used it you never would want it. The desire for it is produced by the use of it.

Our practice of total abstinence is a sensible practice. You cannot find a man in these United States who will say to you, "I am sixty years of age, and I never drank a drop of intoxicating liquor in my life, and I regret very much that I did not learn to use it when I was a boy." Can you find me such a man as that? Search the whole country and find him if you can, and I will take him around as a show. When I was in Norfolk a man came to me and said: "I want to see you. I asked Mr. Proctor, who is doing a star engagement here, to introduce me to you. I care nothing about reforms; they are out of my line. I am forty-two years of age, and I never drank a drop of intoxicating liquor in my life, and I am proud of it. No howling dervish of a temperance-lecturer about me." And in that very same seat was a young man who actually grovelled at my feet. His cry was, "Mr.

Gough, help me out of this hell!" Said I, "For God's sake, what is the matter?" Said he, "Drink is my curse!" That is the cry all over this country, "Drink is my curse!" It comes from your prisons, from your houses of correction,—"Drink is my curse!" It comes from the broken-hearted mother, the wretched, miserable sister. It comes, hissing hot, from the black lips of the dying drunkard, "Drink is my curse!" Not a man living who has escaped it, but rejoices in that fact to-day.

I say our practice is a sensible practice. We don't use any logic, or argument, or philosophy. We simply represent to you the fact that the practice of total abstinence is a sensible practice.

Many persons complain that we attack a good thing. A gentleman once said to me that we were attacking that which was a very excellent thing under certain circumstances. A friend of mine on one occasion said to me that whiskey had saved a great many lives, and I thought I would tell him a story. I said, "You remind me of a boy who wrote a composition about 'Pins'; and he said: 'A pin is a very queer thing, with a round head and a small point. If you stick pins into you they hurt. Men use pins when the buttons are off. You can buy pins for five cents a paper; and if you swallow a pin it will kill you; and they have saved thousands of lives!' The teacher said 'Why, Jimmy, how

do you mean that they have saved thousands of lives?' 'By people not swallowing them,' was the reply. So we allow that whiskey has saved thousands of lives by people not swallowing it."

I am thankful to be able to say to you to-day that we have made great advances in our methods of operating upon public sentiment. Why, you know very well that years ago temperance advocates were the most illiterate and the most ignorant portion of our public speakers, as a general thing. They knew nothing of physiology; they knew nothing of philosophy; they knew nothing of logic. A man could upset them with a few hard words. Suppose I begin to advocate the subject of temperance physiologically. I begin to try to tell you the influence of drink upon the brain and nervous system, and upon the tissues of the body. One of you educationalists, one of you physiologists, would upset me in a minute with a few Latin or Greek names that I didn't know the meaning of. I get the kicks; you get the sympathy. When we temperance-lecturers undertook to defend temperance physiologically, we made a "mess" of it. Now we have men taking ground for us in England,—such men as Sir Henry Thompson, the great surgeon Dr. William Kirk,—and I could mention hundreds of them, for I attended a dinner at Lamb's Hotel with something like two or three hundred medical men,

when I was in England; and lately we have Dr. Andrew Clark, who is surgeon to the hospitals of London. What does he tell us when we say there is no good in alcoholic drink? He says "No; and for a healthy system there is positive injury." He says that a teaspoonful of alcoholic liquor cannot be put into a healthy system without disturbing the harmony of that system at once; and he says that the evil of drunkenness is not *drunkenness*, but *moderation*. He says that in his experience in the hospitals, the difficult cases to cure are the cases of those who have been addicted to drink. It is a factor, he says, in almost every disease, and the most difficult one to overcome. I remember a man in Perth, near Dundee, in Scotland, who wrote an essay for the press, and the queen wrote to Dr. Guthrie to know whether this was an autobiography or a mere essay. She received the reply that it was an autobiography; and she then sent the man twenty pounds as a reward. Sometime afterwards he met with a railway accident. The bones of his leg were terribly crushed. The doctor said that his leg should be amputated. His wife begged that he should not be mutilated. The doctor said that the operation must take place, or mortification would set in. But the queen, hearing of it, sent her favorite physician, Dr. Jenner, to see this man, and after a full examination he said there need be no amputation at all.

He said, "The man has never drank any intoxicating liquor. His system is entirely free from it, and there will be no mortification." I saw the man walking, in the city of Perth, in 1878, without a staff.

We can prove that there is no necessity for using intoxicating liquor. I am not going to run a tilt against the doctors, and say it is never necessary as a medicine. I don't believe in it as a medicine. I would not take it as a medicine. I have a wife who would send any doctor quick to the door that would prescribe it for me. If you wish to take a little lager beer, and you go to the doctor and give him an intimation that you are perfectly willing that he should prescribe it for you, no doubt he will do so. But he will not for *me*, no matter how much I am depressed, or how much I might suffer. They don't tell me to take a little whiskey, or brandy, or lager beer, because they know I will not take it. I don't run a tilt against the physicians. It may be necessary as a medicine. I have nothing to say about it. But we hold, as individual total-abstainers, that it is never necessary as a beverage, and, according to the best physicians, very seldom necessary as a medicine. Some persons have very curious ideas about it. A gentleman once told me that it was impossible that a person should do, after partaking of liquor, what he could not have done before he had taken it, unless there

was nourishment in it,—strengthening in it. "You know as well as I do," I said, "that there may be a great deal of excitability occasioned that never would have otherwise been experienced, without any strength having been given." "No, no," he said,—"if there was activity and excitement imparted, there was nourishment imparted." Now, if you break into a hornets' nest, there is no "nourishment" received there, but there is a great deal of excitement. I tell you you would do under such circumstances what you would never do otherwise, and perhaps you would run faster than you ever ran before in your life, without a particle of strength or nourishment having been given you. We agree that there is *stimulus* in it;—there is the difficulty; there is the danger; if there were no stimulus there would be no danger. What does the drunkard drink for? For stimulus. *Punch* has a very comical picture in regard to a gentleman entertaining some of his farmers with a French light wine. After one man had drank three bottles, the host said, "Do you like the wine?" "Well," said the man, "the wine is very good; but we don't seem to get no *fire* in it." That is what people want. They want something that will fire them. They want something that will help them to start and keep up a lively conversation. No man would run the risk of sacrificing his whole interests, body and soul, to tickle about

two inches of palate. They drink for the stimulus,—and there is the danger.

Now you say, "Why should we work upon these children? Can't we teach them, as Dr. Crosby wishes to teach his young men" (he has a perfect right to do it; I find no fault with it; he is only, I think, mistaken), "by telling them that '*temperance*' is more manly than total abstinence?" Well, that is very comforting to many men. A gentleman once said to me, "I hate excess. I abominate excess. A man who drinks to excess is a beast." "Very good. I hope you will join our association, then." "No; I hate totalism as much as I do excess; because where one is beastly the other is *cowardly*." "I don't understand you." "I stand on the principle of moderation. I say 'follow my example; exercise self-control, self-government.' By the exercise of these qualities you develop your highest and noblest manhood. What do tee-totalers develop? Nothing. You say '*there* is a dangerous article; run like a coward.' I say 'there is a dangerous article; meet it like a man.' 'Let your moderation be known unto all men.' By self-control, self-government, I develop a man. You make him a poltroon. You say 'run'; I say 'stand like a man.' I stand on the manly principle of moderation, between the two extremes,—totalism, which is cowardly, and excess, which is beastly. Exercise self-control, self-government."

When a man comes to that point we cannot let him go. So I said, "What is excess?" "Drinking too much." "Well, what is drinking too much?" "Excess." No progress is made by giving answers like those. "I will ask you a plainer question. Would six tumblers of whiskey toddy in a day be excess for you?" "For me? Well, no; not if I could stand it." *There* is the point, the pivot on which the whole thing turns. If a man drinks as much as he can hold, and stands it, that man is developing his highest and noblest humanity. If he drinks two quarts of rye whiskey in a day and stands it, there is the exercise of self-control, self-denial, self-government,— in the moderate use of intoxicating liquor. If he drinks two glasses and don't stand it, but reels under it, there is fearful evidence of the utter want of self-denial, and self-control, in the excessive use of intoxicating liquor. What is excess? What is moderation? Many a "moderate drinker" drinks a great deal more than the "drunkard" at his elbow. Many a man has been cashiered from the army for drunkenness, when those who sat upon his case drank more liquor than he ever did, or could. Now, then, there are some men that cannot drink moderately, and some men who can. I am not fool enough to stand here and say that every man who drinks is going to ruin. Not at all. But I do say that there are some men who cannot drink moder-

ately. My father could; his son could not. My father was a moderate drinker all his life, and lived to be ninety-four years old, and drank his glass of ale every day,— except during the five years he was with me in this country. I used to go out and get it for him, when I was a mere boy. He drank in moderation; and *I* tried to. I can no more drink intoxicating liquor in moderation than I can blow up a powder magazine in moderation, or fire off a gun a little at a time. Now you say that I am a weak-minded man. Let it go at that if you like. If I am so weak-minded that I cannot drink in moderation, thank God I have been able to let it alone for about forty years.

Now in regard to these children;—I have them all the time in view, although you may say that I am going a very roundabout way to get at them. I don't want to dictate to you what you are to do with regard to your educational methods. You are occupying the highest positions that men and women can occupy,— equal, I hold, with the position of ministers of the Gospel; it is your business to train the young; and while you are teaching them arithmetic and geography, and the languages, you are forming minds, you are developing characters, you are making future citizens of the United States; and there is an awful responsibility resting upon the shoulders of the teachers of the children and the

young people of to-day, and they do not seem to understand it. I know but very little about education. When they say to me, "Shall the teachers teach morals?" or "shall they teach religion?" well, I have my own views about it, though perhaps I am not qualified to speak. I may say this, however, that if you don't teach morals, I don't know what you are going to teach. What is it that you teach that is going to make men and women of character out of your scholars? Is it the Latin and the Greek? Is it the logic and the philosophy? Not a bit of it. In Hawkstone Hall, in England, there lay a man half-naked. Mr. Noble, the leader of the great work there, picked him up and carried him home. The man was the best Greek scholar in all England,—a clergyman of the English Church. He stole Mr. Noble's postage stamps to get liquor with the money obtained for them. When he furnished him with clothes, so that he might go out, including a waistcoat of true clerical cut, they were pawned for liquor, and in less than two weeks he was again destitute of everything, hanging around the corners of the streets begging for money with which to obtain liquor; and yet he was the best Greek scholar in the United Kingdom. Did his Greek save him?

I know there is a great deal said about culture. I suppose it is right to be cultured. I am a rather uncultured "cub," I suppose they call

me, because I have never been to school since I was ten years and six months of age, and what I learned before that time was merely mechanical lessons, and I forgot them just like an old story. To take an interest in culture is all right. But I tell you rather than the culture, give me the moral training. Give me that which will make a man better in character,— not a wiser man in the estimation of the world, but a better man. Culture will do a great deal, but culture will not make a thief into an honest man. It will not make a drunkard into a sober man. It was not culture that induced that man in New York whom I shook hands with the other day, who had planned a burglary, and was waiting around in Cremorne Gardens for his companions,— he had with him his "kit" of burglar's tools; he was waiting for the rest of the company and his revolver, when he went into Jack Macauley's mission, and they were singing hymns. He heard something that struck him like lightning. He went up to Jack Macauley and said, "*There* is a burglar's kit of tools. I started out for a burglary. I am a trained thief,— was trained for it when I was a boy. I am done with it forever." Jack Macauley kept him a week in his rooms, and he became a reformed man. To-day he is going among the tempted and the fallen and saying to them, "you know what I was," and trying to rescue them. While I would not

say a word against culture, I want something beside. I want something that will make honest men and good men. You say that perhaps from the nature of my work I have not much sympathy with yours,—because my work for forty years has been among the neglected and the forlorn,—among those who cannot answer your questions, and when you speak to them they know not what you mean. Now then, we want something done in this country. Is it not worth your while to undertake to devise some plan? They say temperance books in schools are a profound failure, because they are above the capacity of the young people, and so on. I have nothing to suggest except this:—is not this thing worth an effort, among all those who love the young and who are interested in their progress, either intellectual, literary, scientific or practical? Why should not there be a convention of the best men in this country to devise some plan to teach these children that alcoholic drinks are not necessary, but always injurious to health, and then point them, if you please, to the awful effects produced by them? "The farther a man falls, the deeper he goes," is as true in morals as it is in physics; and in my experience of forty years the worst specimens of drunkenness, the most debasing that I have ever found, have been among intellectual and educated men. Charles Garrity tells us that he sat

under the ministry of a very popular clergyman, who afterwards left his church because he was drinking too much, and that he afterwards saw him in a low grog-shop in Liverpool, with a set of dissolute women and drunken men surrounding him, preaching sermons for a glass of whiskey,—"make-believe" sermons.

I remember a man who was associated at one time with Robert Southey in literary work,—in the life of Southey there is an allusion made to this man. He was in my house for eighteen months. I never worked so hard to save one man in all my life as I did to save him. He signed the temperance pledge. They employed him on the old Boston *Atlas*, paying him fifty dollars a week for an article that he would write in a few minutes. He was employed in almost every direction when he was sober; and he was something of a genius. Mr. Bradbury, of Boston, had collected in the course of his business, a large number of wood-cuts, and he proposed to start a magazine, called *The Crucible*. This man was at my house at the time, and they appointed him to be editor. He came to me and said to me, "Here is a mess; they want me to write articles to fit these wood-cuts." He showed me one of the cuts,—that of a man elaborately "rolled out" longitudinally, with long limbs and features, slender and thin and attenuated. He said: "What am I going to make

of that? Here is another cut, of a man walking up and down his room with a baby in his arms, trying to soothe it,—the mother in bed with another child. What am I to make of it? I will make a title-page of the two, and it shall be 'Longfellow's Voices of the Night.'" I worked with that man for twenty-two years. He went to England afterwards, fell, and never recovered. I obtained four photographs,—of his wife, his eldest daughter, whom he used to call "thoughtful-eyed Mary," his youngest girl, whom he called "golden-haired Kitty," his boy Willie. I went to see him and told him I had some photographs that I wanted him to see. He said he didn't want to see them. I said, "John, what is to be the end of all this?" He said he didn't know. I said, "Here is the picture of your wife, worse than a widow; will you give it up for her sake?" "No." "There is thoughtful-eyed Mary, your eldest girl; will you give it up for her?" "No; no." "There is golden-haired Kitty, your bright one, your beautiful one; will you give it up for her?" "No; no." "There is Willie, your only son, old enough to feel the heat of indignation upon his cheek when he hears his father mentioned; will you give it up for him?" "No; no. John Gough, Dives in hell never longed for a drop of water on his parched tongue, as with every power I have in me I long for drink. I *long* for it. *I will have it!*" Theodore Cuyler said there

never was a more awful death-bed in Brooklyn, or a more frightful funeral. Educated gentlemen and ladies, when we know that this evil is abroad in the world, and in this country, and that these, its victims, have no idea of being drawn into the snare, is it not time that in such important meetings as this, and in such an important association as this, something should be devised to warn these children against being ensnared by this peril, and to encourage them to adopt the opposite course? I think it is high time that something should be done. I spoke once, in Mr. Spurgeon's tabernacle, to about seven thousand people, at a meeting of the "Band of Hope." Something like seven hundred thousand children in Great Britain are being trained to total abstinence as a rule of life—

THE PRESIDENT: Won't they be ahead of us soon?

MR. GOUGH: I think they will. I think that with regard to the temperance question they are getting in advance of us very rapidly. I might say here that there are fourteen thousand clergymen of the Church of England with us in this movement. The Catholics engaged such men as Canon Farleigh, and he has spoken in every institution of learning in Great Britain. He told me that he spoke at Oxford University, in the Sheldonian Theatre, where twenty years ago the very thought of such a thing would have been

received with derisive laughter. I would simply say here that when I first went to England I went to Oxford, and no man in Oxford would preside at the meetings where I was to speak. They had to send on to London to get a gentleman to preside. I should like to see my friend Churchill describe the scene enacted there. He could do it much better than I could. About four hundred of the students came to the meeting, with their flat caps, to "row" me. A man had been there a short time before to speak to them on "tobacco," and they had smoked him out. They went there with cigars in their mouths,— and one man kept four going in his mouth at once. They filled the room with smoke so that he could not speak. They "rowed" me, but I was determined that I would stand out my hour and a half there, and I remained at my post, while they were saying and doing all sorts of derisive things. I once turned and saw the London gentleman who was presiding, with his mouth wide open, roaring with laughter. The moment I turned and he perceived that I saw him, his teeth went together like nut-crackers, and he looked all at once very sober. This is to show the feeling there was at Oxford in regard to the introduction of temperance. To be sure by standing there persistently I overcame them, because they got tired of it. I got in a few words towards the close of the evening. One of the directors said he thought I had

managed them pretty well,—that is, by letting them alone. The next time I went was in 1868. I was coaxed into going by Professor Everett. I was introduced by Canon Ellison, and I was invited to a *conversazione* at Max Müllers, not on my own account, for *I* am nobody, but on account of the grand cause I was representing, and which I have advocated for forty years,—and I thank God I have done it with my whole heart.

To show you the progress that has been made in England, I will say that medical men are coming up all through that country, with compromises. I am perfectly willing. I am glad to get anything I can get. I had five bishops at my meeting on the occasion to which I have referred. The idea of having a lord bishop on the platform with me flustered me at first, and at one time I addressed him as "Mister,"—a Lord Bishop! I said to them, "I don't like compromises. Compromises remind me of a story that a negro once told. He said: "Since I have belonged to the church I have oftentimes been strongly tempted to steal, as I used to do before I joined. One day I went into a boot and shoe store, and there I noticed the handsomest pair of boots I ever saw in my life. The devil said to me, 'Did you ever see such a pair of boots? Take them. Take them.' But the Lord stood by, and said, 'Let the boots alone.' I wanted to take the boots dreadfully. There was I, and

there was the devil; that made two on that side of the question. The Lord said, 'Let the boots alone';—There was only one on that side. Now I said to myself, 'Here is a clear majority of two to one. I don't know what to do.' So I thought I would make a compromise with the Lord,—and I took a cheap pair of shoes, off of another shelf." That expresses my idea of a compromise of right and wrong, anywhere,—whether in schools or in colleges,—"modify it, but don't root it out." I believe in "rooting it out." This is another digression. But we rejoice and are exceeding glad to see such a wonderful result from forty or fifty years of hard work. It has not been brought about "all of a sudden"; it has been accomplished by hard work. There have been influences which touched the match,—as there were when the little girl touched the match and the dynamite exploded, but the work had all been done before, under the surface, out of sight. That is the work that has been done in England; and the English people did it because they were absolutely scared at the immense evil, growing upon the people, of drunkenness, and at the terrible brutality which it caused among the people. And I do believe that the ministers were somewhat driven into it by the example of those who were so far below them in the social scale. It reminded me of the costermonger who had a donkey that would not go up hill with the cart.

After coaxing him a long time in vain, the man took the donkey out and drew the cart up himself. "What did you do that for?" said a bystander. "I am trying to *shame* him into it," rejoined the man. So these men were, some of them, absolutely "*shamed into it*," and the others came into it of their own free will and accord.

Now we are not afraid that all these boys will become drunkards; not at all. But if you take this room full of young men, and let every one of them go out of this house declaring, "Now I am going to be a moderate drinker,— exercise self-control, exercise self-government," and if you take your pen and paper and make a calculation, as accurate as you would if you were working out a problem of life assurance, what proportion of those young men will become drunkards, you can do it just as correctly and certainly. *Some of them* will. You say there is no necessity for it. I care not for the necessity; some of them *will*, and you know it,— and not one of them but enters the outer circle of the whirlpool without contemplating the awful vortex there may be within for him.

As I speak, thoughts crowd upon me, and the time is passing so rapidly that I must very soon draw these remarks to a close. I feel very earnestly upon this subject. But perhaps you gentlemen of logic, that come to your conclusions by certain approaches, so that when you have made

a deduction you are sure of it, say that my conclusions are rather vague. Let them be vague if they will; I cannot help it. I feel intensely earnest on this question. Gentlemen, I know what it is to have seven years of my life blotted out;—and worse than that; you can never save a man from the result of seven years of dissipation. You may put your hand into the hand of a giant, and he shall crush it, and you take your hand out mangled, crushed and bleeding. You may get that hand healed and made useful again; but its beauty, its symmetry, are gone forever; and when the symmetry of a man's life is broken by any dissipation, or any moral corruption, or wrong, you never can replace it, as long as he lives. He will carry the scars with him to the grave. The hand may be healed; but it will be a mutilated one as long as he lives. Therefore when I look at these boys I think of myself. One of them came to me the other day, and in his winning, childish way said, "Please, Mr. Gough, will you write in my album?" I said, "Yes, my dear boy, I will." God bless them; I would do anything for them, to help build a barrier between them and that which has cursed me. I *hate* intoxicating drink,—HATE it! And I pray God to give me an everlasting and ever-increasing capacity to hate it,—the accursed thing that blasts and blights and scathes and mildews and *damns* everything that

is bright, noble, manly, god-like in a human being. Do we exaggerate? A boy bounds into your room to-morrow morning. You love him. He lays his smooth face to your cheek. He is a bright boy. You idolize him. You *love* him. A friend comes in, and you say, "Do you see my boy? Come here, old fellow, ha! ha! Come here, old fellow." You *love* him. What would you do to save that beautiful boy from curvature of the spine? "Do? *Anything!*" "What? Would you give up all your property, sacrifice every luxury on this earth?" "Don't mention it. Look at him, in his bright, boyish beauty, so symmetrical, so elastic, so graceful! Don't ask me what I would do. *Anything!*" It is a dreadful thing, this disease of the curvature of the spine. Is it not a dreadful thing? I was a guest at a gentleman's house in which was a child who had fallen out of a swing backwards when he was four years of age. It was a very curious case. Many physicians visited that child. His body had developed in a very great degree, but the legs and arms were as small as those of a child of four years of age. They had not grown at all. The little creature would crawl on the floor like a turtle. I never saw an animal or a reptile crawl that made me shudder as it did to see that little child on the floor. The little creature said, "I shall not trouble you long, mamma." "Don't speak of trouble," she

said, "you are the joy of our home, the light of our household. We are learning from you lessons of trust, faith, patience. Don't talk of trouble, dear; when you are gone it will be a sad day for us." "Oh, mamma! I want to go; I am so tired. But when I go to heaven, mamma, I shall stand up straight, sha'n't I?" There is comfort and joy and beauty and love, all clustered around a crippled child. Is there any around your *drunken* son,— any light but the light that comes lurid from hell,— that drunken boy who comes reeling in at midnight, breathing pestilence, making the air poisonous with a horrible effluvia, and muttering through his dry, cracked lips words that you shudder to hear? No sir!

What would you do to save your child from epilepsy? That is worse than the other. Many of you know the Rev. J. B. Wheatley, once of New York, afterwards at Jersey City. At his house there was a boy afflicted with epilepsy. While we were conversing there we heard the boy twisting around the hall, foaming at the mouth and crunching his teeth. The father dropped on his knees and uttered such a prayer as I scarce ever heard before. He said, "When I look at that child and remember that four years ago he was first in his class, a lad ten years of age, and see him stand before me now, with eyes set, fingers stretched wide apart, gasping out

unintelligible words, and breaking his mother's heart, I cannot speak for very grief. Yet, as I am a man and a minister of the Gospel, his mother and I had rather see that boy just as he is, than see him a drunkard." So would you have said if the child had been your own. There is no mother or father here that will not say the same,—"Let the Lord do as he will with that boy of mine; but save him, oh! save him from being a self-made wreck!" I met Mr. Wheatley a short time after and said, "How is Harry?" "Harry is well." "Is he cured?" "The Saviour loved that suffering child and took him home. One of the great anticipations I have by and by is to meet Harry." There is comfort, consolation, some degree of peace and even of joyful hope about that. I have been at homes when they told me before I went not to ask about their son. It is very sad. They have taken the photograph out of the album and the picture from the wall. They cannot bear to contemplate him as he was, and then think of the blackness of darkness of despair into which he passed. Now we do not exaggerate. Oh! I tell you when this evil does come into a household it is a frightful evil; and it is worth an immense amount of effort, it is worth an immense expenditure of trouble and toil, and an untold amount of self-sacrifice, to do something in our public schools to instruct these children with regard to the evil

effects of alchoholic drink,—in no dogmatic spirit or style, telling them, "You must do this, and you must do that," but simply, quietly making it a part of their education. That is not introducing sectarianism into the public schools. How horribly afraid some people are of sectarianism! You cannot say anything that reaches outside of their little circle of ideas without their stigmatizing it as "sectarianism." We don't pretend to force these children;—only we would instruct them. We want to show them the terrible effects of this evil. A great many people say to me that it is above the apprehension of these children. No, sir, it is not. We underrate them; you know their capacity is often underrated. You often hear a bright remark from a child, and you say, "It is a hap-hazard remark"; but you find afterwards that it is the result of reasoning in the child's mind. I knew two boys; one Jim and the other Willie; and Willie had caught a fly; and Jim was seated on a door-step whittling a stick; and Willie said, "What a queer thing a fly is, ain't it, Jim? Just look at him. See his wings and his head and his legs, ain't he queer? Now if I pull him he will buzz. What a queer thing a fly is. Do you know how God made him, Jim? How do you suppose God made that fly?" Well, they are trying to find out to-day how these things are made. The other boy said at once, "God don't make things

like carpenters make them. He don't put them together and fit them and plane them off. God says 'Let there be flies,' and there is flies." Now you say that that was a hap-hazard remark. No; the boy had heard, or read, "God said, 'Let there be light, and there was light,'" and he *reasoned* from that about the creative power of the Almighty in general.

I have not found but that the children were susceptible to instruction in anything I told them. I can bring children up to my own capacity and knowledge very easily. They *do* understand, and they *do* imitate. A gentleman sat at a table,—Charles Garrity relates it,—the waiter was waiting on his boy, about ten or twelve years old. The father was one of those gentlemen who take wine with their dinner; and the waiter said to the son, "What will you take, young lad?" "I will take what papa takes." His father had in his hand a decanter, to turn himself out a glass of wine. He dropped it as if it were fire, and said, "Waiter, bring me a glass of water," and the boy and the father drank water together. Do you suppose these boys don't understand? A lady who had a husband that used to use terribly profane language, once overheard her boy use an oath. She said, "My dear child, it is a dreadful thing that you have done,—a very naughty thing. You must ask God to forgive you." He did not like it very much, and he was

a little sulky. But he went away, and presently she overheard him saying his prayer, and it was this: "Oh, God, I am sorry I have done naughty thing,—said naughty word; hope you will forgive me; and I guess you will. But I want you to hurry up and grow me up to be a man, so that I can swear as my father does; then I can swear and not be naughty." Don't these children understand? It is amusing how your children will follow your example, and how they cling to a loving teacher, and a loving teacher's example. There are boys and girls in this country who actually worship their teachers and regard with reverence all that they say. To be sure, my experience has not been among exactly the same class that yours has. Mine has been among the children of the poor. Keen! Wonderfully keen! Did you ever try to "chaff" a street boy? If you ever did you certainly got the worst of it,—or nine times out of ten. A gentleman very much developed in his corporosity came rolling along the streets, and sang out to a little fellow before him, who was somewhat in his way, "Don't you see me, fellow?" "Yes, sir, I can see you *with the naked eye*." Your boy would not have said anything smarter than that. "Get out of my way." "Which way round?" Chaff *them*, if you will! During the war the boot-blacks were around for a job from every soldier and officer they could lay their

hands upon. One man, with tremendous big boots,— number tens,— having engaged one of these urchins for a "shine," the young polisher, after viewing the pedal extremities with astonishment, called another boy and said, "Jimmy, lend me some spit. I've got an *army contract*." Wonderfully keen and wonderfully impudent they often are.

Take hold of those children, who have no education, no opportunities. Oh! my friends, there are a great many that have no opportunities. When I spoke to an audience once upon the subject of "caste,"—the very stench of that audience was sickening;—it was a very hard audience to speak to;—I reasoned thus: "Now I will be you, and you shall be me. What would I say if I sat where you sit, and you got up here and began to talk to me?" I would say, 'Mind your own business; it is none of your business what I do, unless I interfere with you. I have had no opportunities. Give me your clothes and your opportunities, and I will be as good a man as you are. I never had a chance.'" So I said I must go down, not to their degradation, but to their humanity. And I began to say to them that poverty was no degradation, telling them such a story as this: "A poor woman had lain helpless for twenty-two years, not having moved a limb, racked with pain. An old woman watched over her, coming in twice a day to see that she did not

suffer. Some one knocked at the door, and received a pleasant 'come in.' 'How are you this morning?' 'Oh! I am so thankful!' 'Thankful? For what? Thankful for pain? Thankful for poverty? Thankful for hopelessness? Thankful for never having seen the sunlight?' 'I have got the use of one thumb; and when they leave me they tie a skewer upon my thumb, and put the Bible where I can open the leaves, and I lay here and turn them over; and I am so thankful!'" Now that seemingly trifling occasion for gratitude, that would not perhaps have affected you or me, made one woman clasp her hands, and cry out, "Oh, my God!" and fall back upon her seat. There is a great work in this world to do. To do it you must get at men's hearts. To do it you must get at the hearts of your children, and you must get at their consciences,—if you would train them up to be what you would wish them to be in the next generation.

Is it not worth while to try to devise some plan, in your consultations together here, whereby the children of this country shall be instructed, in some measure, in these things? Get men to write books that children can understand, and which will be interesting to them, inculcating the great lesson of temperance. Give it to them with stereopticon views, if you see fit. But let *something* be done to save these children, and to save this coming generation.

I know people say this is a Utopian scheme. Never mind. We are in the minority, perhaps, to-day, but we will not be there for a great while. It is not the question with us whether it succeeds now. If it is a good cause, it has got to succeed. If intemperance is to cease in this nation, our cause will succeed. Let us be workers together,—our motto: "Excelsior!" and with the hope that there is a better day coming for us by and by,—our prayer always, in humble, reverent faith: "God speed the right!"

SECOND DAY, JULY 13.

VI.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION.

READ BY THE SECRETARY OF COMMITTEE, MR. JOHN S. CLARK, OF BOSTON.

To the American Institute of Instruction:

YOUR committee chosen to investigate the subject of Industrial Education, and to report thereon to your Association, beg to submit the following as their conclusions and recommendations:

Your committee are of opinion that there should be incorporated in the present schemes for public education, broader provisions than now exist for imparting to our youth the elements of knowledge and skill required in the industrial arts: not alone for the development of these arts, but also as a part of a general system of public education, having for its object the training for citizenship through the normal development of individual power.

To this end they would recommend:

First, The introduction into public schools of proper appliances for the development of the sense-perception of pupils in regard to color, form, proportion, etc., by contact with models and with natural objects.

Second, The introduction into grammar schools of simple physical and chemical experiments, for the purpose of acquainting pupils, through original observation, with the elements of chemical and physical science and their common applications in the arts.

Third, The teaching of drawing, not as an accomplishment, but as a language for the graphic presentation of the facts of forms and of objects; for the representation of the appearance of objects; and also as a means of developing taste in industrial design.

Fourth, The introduction into grammar and high schools, of instruction in the use of tools; not for their application in any particular trade or trades, but for developing skill of hand in the fundamental manipulations connected with the industrial arts, and also as a means of mental development.

In view of the fact that much misconception exists in regard to giving instruction in the several features recommended, and of the desirability of more information in regard to their practical introduction into the schools, your committee sug-

gest a further examination into the general subject of Industrial Education and its relation to public education.

FRANCIS A. WALKER,
M. C. FERNALD,
J. W. PATTERSON,
M. H. BUCKHAM,
WILLIAM B. WEEDEN,
WM. H. BREWER,
JOHN S. CLARK.

After submitting the above report, the secretary of the committee, Mr. Clark, read the following paper:

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION A NECESSARY PART OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.

BY JOHN S. CLARK, OF BOSTON, MASS.

WHAT education is, and how education should be applied, are questions by no means new. They appear with more or less distinctness in all forms of social organization. The training of youth is one of the primal considerations forced upon man in a primitive stage of development. It grows in complexity and importance with every step in his progress in civilization, until in the

higher forms of social order it becomes of fundamental, if not of paramount importance.

Setting aside for the time being the idea of education prevailing among schoolmen, let us consider it briefly as a functional feature in the social organism.

Man does not live by himself, or for himself alone. Collaterally with the development of his individual freedom, there has been developed a constantly increasing dependence upon his brother man. He is ushered into the world under conditions which enslave him to the social needs of his time; he cannot emancipate himself from the demands of his social environment. While he is born an heir to the accumulated results of his progenitors, he is free only as he adds something to those results as the sum of his own life. His failure to make such addition brings loss of personal freedom; his refusal to do so entails social disabilities; his persistent refusal, social disgrace. No individual is born with an instinctive knowledge of the social acquirements, or of the social needs. While his share in the world's patrimony is undoubted, and while it will be meted out to him according to the prevailing laws of social exchange, he is yet born to his inheritance and his opportunities, utterly ignorant of the knowledge which enables him to appreciate the former, and utterly deficient in the power which enables him to command the latter.

The helplessness of infancy, and the long period of adolescence, have been among the main conditions which have made possible man's continued progress in civilization. Accordingly, the training of youth has not only been an important matter of public concern in nearly all forms of social aggregation, but the aims and methods of such training also reflect more truly, perhaps, than any other one feature, the civilized status of the tribe, community, or state. A brief examination of the methods of training youth among primitive races, of the educational ideas which were developed in ancient Greece and Rome, which prevailed during the Middle Ages, and which exist at the present time, would not only show that the conditions of social development in these respective periods were mirrored in their educational provisions, but would also bring into clear light the fact that by the training given to youth, more than by any other cause, is civilization developed and perpetuated, or hindered and destroyed.*

* "We must settle what we want to make of the pupils, or everything will go at random. In every country of the world there is some sort of general notion of what the men and women in it ought to be; and the men and women turn out accordingly; and the more certainly, the more clear the notion is." — *Miss Martineau*, "*Household Education.*" The author then points out the patriarch's idea of training youth some thousands of years ago; how the Spartan educated his child to become a perfect soldier of the state; a Jew, to obey the letter of the law; an Arab, to become a perfect horseman; an Indian, an independent warrior, etc.

Education, therefore, considered from the social standpoint, may be regarded as the reproductive function in the social organism; and the educational needs of any period or people should be considered with reference to the nature of the social organism to be perpetuated and developed.

With this general underlying idea of education as our starting-point, let us now consider for a moment the nature, or the type of social organization which it is our duty to perpetuate and develop to-day.

The basis of the present type of social order is individualism,—the freedom of each individual,—and the general tendency of social development is in this direction; so much so that in America and in some of the European states, social order is developing through the giving to each individual, freedom to think, freedom to labor, and freedom to exchange labor. The contrast between this type of social order and the militant type which preceded it can only be noted; the manner, however, in which individuals are ranging themselves in the fundamental social employments under the new conditions is a matter which should be of great interest to the educator, as well as to the student of social science.

Classifying these employments somewhat in the order of their functional activity, they present the following grouping:

Employments at the Present Time.

Productive.	Those which contribute to individual and social necessities in the production of food, minerals, raw materials, building and machinery construction, industrial articles.
Distributive.	Those which contribute to individual and social needs by distributing the products of the productive employments,—trade and transportation, banks, bankers, etc.
Governmental.	Those connected with legislation, administration, and protection.
Professional.	Those connected with individual well-being, and the applications of literature, science, and art,—education, law, medicine, divinity, journalism, designing.
Culture.	Those connected with the pursuit of science, philosophy, sociology, literature, art, —employments which tend to stimulate and enrich the whole organism.
Unclassified.	Domestic servants, unskilled laborers.

A comprehensive view of these activities shows that human thought is a vital force in them all, and that it is manifesting itself mainly in the subjection of the material world to the higher interests of man. It should be noted, further, that the productive and the distributive employments are the primal ones, that they minister most directly to the necessities of the organism, and that only through their broad and harmonious development the highest good of the organism arises.

In education, as in sociology, it is important that the reciprocal relation of these two primal

groups should be clearly comprehended; and it should also be seen how differently thought manifests itself in them. Thought in the productive group creates values, mainly by the concrete work of the hand; thought in the distributive group is devoted to exchanging these values, mainly by the use of language. In the former thought is expended in doing, in creating; in the latter, in describing and exchanging the things created. While each group is necessary to the other, the activity which benefits both is mainly generated in the productive group; on the other hand, the activity generated in the distributive group often proves fatal to both.*

Examining the productive group a little closer, we observe two main lines of activity in the creation of values:

First, those connected with the gathering of food and raw materials.

Second, those connected with the fabrication of raw materials into articles for social needs; in other words, the industrial employments.

In both these divisions the individual is brought into direct contact with the material world; and in the industrial employments particularly, nature and nature's forces are converted by human

---

*It would not be difficult to show that nearly all recent financial disturbances have arisen from an undue expansion of the distributive employments.

thought into numberless products adapted to the necessities and the well-being of mankind.

A brief study of our present social development would show that its main activities are generated in the industrial portion of the productive group, that individuals are ranging themselves in these activities in a far greater proportion than ever before; and by subjecting nature and nature's forces to social needs, they have not only given increased activity to all the employments below them in the productive group, but they have pushed forward enormously the distributive employments above them, as well as laid under fresh contributions those higher activities connected with culture and individual well-being, which minister to the best interests of the whole organism: so that, collaterally with this industrial development, we see men's thoughts expanding in every direction, resulting in greater achievements in science, the development of higher standards of public taste, of purer ideas in regard to morals and religious beliefs, and better types of political organization.

It is not necessary to catalogue the benefits, spiritual as well as material, which have come to the race as the result of this new social development. We are all more or less witnesses to them. The conquest of thought over matter and material force has been productive of such rapid,

brilliant, and far-reaching results that the imagination has oftentimes lost itself in the contemplation of the mere results achieved, and has not infrequently failed to appreciate the nature and the source of the thought itself. These, however, are but the vagaries of a great period of social development,—the general trend is in the right direction; and we have only to give human thought its proper recognition in these material conquests, to see that instead of there having been any conquest of matter over mind, there has been the greatest conquest of mind over matter the world has ever seen. A period of social development which produces simultaneously two such minds as Emerson and Darwin, and extends equal honors to both, cannot be charged with gross materialism or with undue idealism.

It is too much the habit of our time to depreciate the present as compared with some ideal social development of the past. We do not sufficiently realize how great has been the social advance in nearly all directions, and correspondingly how greatly individual responsibilities have increased. Says a brilliant writer, in his *History of the Reign of Queen Victoria*, "A man of the present day suddenly thrust back fifty years in life would find himself as awkwardly unsuited to the ways of that time, as if he were

sent back to the time when the Romans occupied Britain." And this is hardly an exaggeration.*

To claim for our type of social order, and the development which it has engendered, a superiority over all previous periods, is neither spread-eagleism, nor an undue Americanism; but to make this claim without considering the antecedents of this development and what it has cost, and without fully comprehending the responsibilities which attach to its preservation, would be to indulge in foolish rhetoric and silly pride.

Having seen that education should be the fitting of youth for their social responsibilities, it follows that the education of youth to-day should be a preparation for citizenship in this broad, this unexampled, nineteenth-century civilization.

Turning now from the objective side of the question,—from what we are to educate the individual to,—let us look a moment at the subjective side, the physiological conditions which prescribe the educational development in each individual. The brain is the seat of individual power; and to this organism, as a distinctly de-

* "One peculiarity of this age is the sudden acquisition of much physical knowledge. There is scarcely a department of science or art which is the same, or at all the same, as it was fifty years ago. A new world of inventions — of railways and of telegraphs — has grown up around us which we cannot help seeing; a new world of ideas is in the air, and affects us, though we do not see it."— *Bagehot, Physics and Politics.*

fined objective point, are we obliged to direct our educational training. The brain itself is entirely removed from direct contact with the material world. Physiologists tell us that it is made up of white and gray nerve-matter, and that in the adult of civilized races the average weight is about fifty ounces. The latest researches of microscopic investigation reveal in this organism only material substance; and yet back of this material substance, eluding the most subtile analysis, there is born in every human brain the power which we call thought, which will in due time not only animate the material substance of the brain, but will also use this substance as the base and seat of power: first for the subjugation of its immediate individual environment, and then for conquests in the world at large.

While natural science offers no solution of the enigma, whence and whither this thought, and is silent as to its constituent elements, we are forced to recognize its existence, and the manner in which it is generated. Without entering into either metaphysical or physiological details, we may say that the real aim in education is to get at this power of thought, to stimulate it to activity and give it means of expression; and to do this we have to study the nature of the material physiological organism which enshrouds it. Studying the nature of this organism, we have to observe that its connection with the outer

world is by means of servants, the senses; that it is stirred to action, to the generation of thought, primarily through these servants; and it follows from this fact that the nature, the quality, and in a great measure the quantity, of the thought generated and expressed, depends largely upon the manner in which these senses are trained to become faithful servants to the brain. This point needs no elaboration. It will readily be admitted that the eye which cannot distinguish form, color, proportion, distance; that the ear which cannot distinguish different properties in sound; that the tongue and the hand which cannot express the thought which is generated,—are one and all incompetent servants to the brain, and obstruct the healthful development of thought.

Thus much being true, we have to note two functions which these servants perform in the service of the brain. The first is in carrying information or phenomena to it as food for thought; the second is in carrying from the brain the thought generated. A brief examination shows that information is conveyed to the brain by all the five senses, while for conveying thought from the brain, only two organs of these senses are made use of,— viz.: the tongue and the hand. It follows from this that the practical equipment of the brain requires that the tongue and the hand

should have such special training as to be able to convey whatever thought may be generated.

Referring now to the social organism we have been considering, we have to note that the social needs require the expression of thought, concretely by the work of the hand in labor—particularly in the productive employments, and abstractly by the use of language in the other employments; and we have to note further that the activities which require its expression by the use of the hand in labor are as fundamental to the best interests of the organism as those which require its expression by language. It follows from this that the educational training of our youth to-day should include a training to express thought by the labor of the hand as well as a training to express it by language.

The pertinent question now arises: Are the aims and methods prevailing in public education in conformity to the physiological conditions of individuals and to modern social requirements?

To answer this question properly, we should have a clear conception of what these aims and methods are, and also some acquaintance with their historical development.

If the statement were made that the aim of the prevailing education was not practical training for citizenship, it would be resented with some degree of feeling. It would be insisted that it has for its main object or aim, preparation for

citizenship. If the inquiry were pushed as to how it fits for citizenship, the reply would be: By the complete and harmonious development of mental power: and with this vague phrase it would be assumed that the whole field of practical educational training was covered.

If, however, we push the inquiry still further for the purpose of seeing how this mental power is developed, and what the outcome is, two things will be apparent:

First. That this mental power is not generated so much by the action of the senses upon the brain — by direct contact of individuals with their material environment, — as it is through the memory and imagination by the use of words, which record the acts and the thoughts of others.

Second. That the outcome of this means of developing mental power is confined mainly to a second-hand knowledge of nature and human life, and is limited to the power of expressing thought by words alone.

The result of such education is mainly intellectual in its character. It pays little or no respect to labor as such, — to the training of the hand to become the servant of the brain in labor. It exalts thinking above doing. It tends to dissociate the ideal from the real, to engender false ideas in regard to man and his social duties, and consequently to perpetuate a repugnance to

skilled labor, the great fulcrum upon which our modern civilization rests.

The charge that the prevailing education engenders false ideas in regard to labor is so frequently made, and is so strenuously denied, it is well worth our while to examine closely into the facts in the case.

Notwithstanding the great advances which have been made in all branches of social development since the period of Greek culture, comparatively little advance has been made in the object of mental training. The youth in all civilized states are to-day more under the influence of the educational theories of Plato and Aristotle on this point than of any other thinkers or educators since their day.* Such has been the weight of authority attaching to these two great minds of antiquity, that although their ideas of education were developed under a social organization widely different from our own, their opinions as to what knowledge is of most worth, and their belief that mental training should be entirely dissociated from the affairs of practical life, are still of binding force. Neither of these think-

*It is only necessary to examine the curricula of the German schools, of the great English public schools and universities, and of our own leading colleges, to see how large a proportion of the instruction is devoted to language, literature, and abstract mathematics, the chief branches recommended for study by the ancients, to feel the force of this apparently hyperbolical statement.

ers had the conception of a social order based upon the citizenship of our modern development, — the rank of the Athenian citizen, for whom their education was intended, was not unlike that of the English gentleman of our time; and their conceptions of education, therefore, were permeated with ideas of class distinctions wholly antagonistic to the individualism which prevails to-day. Possessing only rudimentary knowledge in regard to natural science, which is but the thought of man in regard to the material world, they were able to give instruction only in the most meagre way in regard to man's natural environment; and with their openly expressed disgust for manual labor, they crippled the development of human thought, save in the direction of literature, art, politics, and metaphysics.*

* "Of the work necessary to the well being of a state, Plato thought that there were three principal kinds,— the work of producing the material commodities essential to life, the work of protecting the state against external enemies and of preserving order within it, and the work of legislation and government. For the class of citizens engaged in the first kind of work he apparently did not think that any public system of education was necessary, a fact which, however much at variance with modern ideas, will not startle any one who is familiar with the position of the industrial classes in Greek society, and with the opinions entertained of them, both by the public and by philosophers. It was then for the classes who are engaged in military and political functions, that is, in what a Greek would consider the functions of a citizen proper, that the education sketched in the earlier parts of the Republic is exclusively intended."— *Theory of Education*

The writings of both these great thinkers abound in expressions showing a contempt for the common avocations of life: Plato affirming that "human affairs are hardly worth considering in earnest," that "the study of number is valuable only for the sake of knowledge," and that "geometry should not be taught for any practical purpose." Aristotle is equally emphatic on this point, saying that "employments used for gain take from the leisure of the mind and render it sordid."

The recognition of class distinctions in social life, and the endeavor to limit educational training to literary and metaphysical studies, by the dissociation of thought from nature on the one hand, and the condemnation of labor or skill as a means for expressing thought on the other, can be traced through all forms of education since the time of Plato. These false ideas completely permeated Roman education, as is seen in the works of Cicero and Quintilian. They held undisputed sway during the Middle Ages, as the famous Trivium and Quadrivium abundantly show; and they hold a preponderating influence at the present time, as is indicated by the meagre attention paid to the study of nature in public education and the general absence of provisions for industrial training.

---

in Plato's Republic, by R. L. Nettleship, Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford.

We must not ignore the fact that there have been many protests against this training in mere words, against this literary or humanistic education, as it has been called; and the history of education in modern times presents the names of Comenius, Bacon, Locke, Milton, Montaigne, Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Froebel, as radical educational reformers, who sought to bring the training of youth more into conformity with modern requirements. Such, however, has been the hold of the humanistic idea, from the university to the primary school, that the influence of these great thinkers has been unable until our own day to make an appreciable impression upon the public mind; and even now their ideas are only beginning to be appreciated.

Our brief survey, therefore, brings out this fact: that while we have entered upon comparatively a new order of social development, which brings new duties and new responsibilities to each individual, we still cling in our ideas of education to methods of mental training which were developed under entirely different social conditions from our own, and which tend to develop ideas of social life antagonistic to the fundamental principles upon which our present social order is based. Hence there is a conflict between the old and the new; and the very wide-spread feeling of dissatisfaction which exists in regard to the

outcome of the present educational training, is because it does not conform to present needs.

But it may be asked: What is the evidence upon which the present education is condemned? Does it come from discontented tax-payers, representatives of class distinctions, or from the literary critics who have found in our public schools imaginary sources of all our social evils? By no means. The criticism from such sources is hardly worth considering. The greater part of it is animated by a spirit more or less hostile to all public education save of the meaner sort. The real objection is deeper and more fundamental, and is rarely expressed with clearness. It is not that the schools attempt to teach too much, but that their methods of instruction are defective; not that they fail to develop mental power, but that the kind of mental power developed is not broad enough and practical enough — in short not high enough — to satisfy the demands of citizenship today. The evidence on this point is shown by the fact that we are sending from the schools so few pupils fitted to become workers in the social organism in other than the mercantile and professional occupations. We have seen by our study of the social organism that the industrial employments are not only calling for an increasing proportion of the population, but that the nature of these employments requires a high degree of thought, generated by an observation of nature and ex-

pressed by the skill of the hand. Now it is a fact which can easily be demonstrated that comparatively few of our public schools give sound instruction in natural science, or present labor in the industrial employments as honorable as in the mercantile or professional ones; hence our American youth enter these employments only on compulsion, and the scarcity of well-educated American mechanics is one of the anomalies of our present industrial development.* A case in point well illustrates this fact.

The Board of Education of Chicago advertised a few weeks since for a number of persons with a sufficient knowledge of reading, writing, and arithmetic, to take the census of the public schools at the rate of two dollars and a half per day. Immediately five hundred persons applied to do the work.

Now Chicago is one of the busiest cities in the world. It is a place where any person capable of doing intelligent work with his hands can readily find employment. Indeed, the difficulty is to find intelligent workmen at wages ranging from

---

*The industrial employments now offer for young men far greater opportunities for honorable and successful business careers than any other lines of employment; but success in industrial enterprises demands, as an essential part of an educational training, a knowledge of materials, a knowledge of drawing and applied science and mechanics, and a practical acquaintance with the use of the fundamental tools by which skilled manual labor is produced.

three to five dollars per day; and yet we find here a great superabundance of people, well-trained mentally, who would feel it derogatory to engage in any mechanical employment, and yet desirous of selling their services at two dollars and a half per day.

Any one who has had experience in business knows how easy it is to get persons capable of doing any kind of clerical work. Indeed, it was not an extravagant statement of a New England manufacturer, that it was far easier for him to get a clerk in his counting-room capable of making a good translation of the Iliad or the Æneid, than it was to get a workman in his factory capable of running his machinery.

The general tendency of the instruction in our schools was well illustrated recently by a test applied to the public schools of Boston and of Quincy, Mass. The editor of the Boston *Herald*, much interested in this question of practical education, had submitted to the pupils in various schools as the subject of a composition, this question: "What is my school doing for me?"

---

*It would not be difficult to get evidence on this point which would be striking, from both an educational and social point of view. One instance will suffice. Not long since a legal firm in Boston advertised for a copying clerk, and within a week over three hundred applications were received from men and women, nearly all well written, and some of them piteous in their appeals for wages far below what women receive in many branches of industry.

Thirty-one of the compositions were printed, and the striking fact in regard to them was, that the writers were all looking to the mercantile and professional employments for their future occupations; and they told with perfect unconsciousness how well their schools were fitting them for those occupations. Although many of the pupils were children of the wage-earning class, only one, and this a girl, so much as alluded to the possibility of getting a living by a trade; while one Irish boy admitted with complete frankness that as the result of his school training he hoped to be lecturer, orator, "representator," and perhaps President of the United States.

Comparing, therefore, the needs of citizenship at the present time with the outcome of our educational training, we observe a great want of harmony between them. It is true that various efforts have been made to bring our public education more into conformity with the needs of our time, and various new studies claimed to be of a practical character have been introduced; but it will be seen on examination that most of these efforts have ended simply in extending the curriculum of abstractions in the schools, rather than in modifying the methods of generating thought and giving it greater power of expression.

Our prevailing education, therefore, being prac-

tically out of joint, what is the remedy? The obvious answer is: Bring it into conformity with the social and individual needs of the time, so that it shall give us the good citizen through the normal development of his individual powers for both thinking and working.

A course of educational training having this end in view would present the following features:

First. The bringing of the individual in contact with nature and material things, as the starting-point for training the senses to become accurate servants to the brain, and storing the mind with elementary ideas of the quality of things, originally obtained.

Second. Such continued study of nature as leads to natural science: which is the classified thought of man in regard to nature and the forces of the material world.

Third. The study of literature, art, history, government, mental and moral philosophy, for the development of ideas in regard to man and his institutions.

Fourth. Collaterally with this training of the senses, this study of nature, and this study of man, there should be proper training in the use of language (inclusive of the language of number and form) for the purpose of receiving and expressing thought abstractly; and also proper

training of the hand in the use of tools for the purpose of expressing thought concretely.*

The elaboration of the details of a course of educational training which will bring these features into harmony with one another, will require much thought and much experiment in the schools. If the course be conceived in the proper spirit, it presents nothing really antagonistic to what now prevails; rather it will be seen to correct and supplement the prevailing literary education. By making nature the starting-point in intellectual development, the study of words will be relegated to its proper sphere, and science, literature, history, philosophy can then be given a harmonious development which will result in juster and nobler ideas of man and his institutions. By adding to language training the training of the hand to manual labor, the activity of thought will be greatly accelerated: and, by displaying itself in concrete as well as abstract form, the beneficent influence of art will be given free play, and new industrial creations will meet new or expanding social needs, thus giving dignity to whatever is produced by human hands.

That the tendency of the time is toward a general educational training, such as is here indi-

* The tools here recommended are such hand and machine tools as are used fundamentally in the manipulations of wood, stone, and metals, — the hammer, saw, plane, chisel, gauge, square, file, lathe, planer, milling machine, etc.

cated, will be apparent to any one who studies the general drift of educational discussion. The failure or ill-adaptedness of our old methods of dealing with abstractions, and of developing the power of expressing thought by words alone, is patent on every side; and it will not be a difficult matter to conform present education to the new requirements when the conditions of the problem are fairly comprehended.

A course of study to meet these new demands has been pretty well worked out for our primary education, including in this term primary and grammar schools. The new features necessary to be introduced into the schools may be outlined as follows:

First. The introduction into primary schools of methods of teaching whereby children will be brought into contact with objects or things through their senses, for the purpose of developing their perceptive powers in regard to color, form, quality, and size of common objects, and whereby they will be trained in the use of language, number, and drawing, to express abstractly their conceptions in regard to these objects, and by moulding and other forms of work to express their conceptions concretely.

Second. The introduction into grammar schools of (*a*) Experimental observations, which shall illustrate common physical and chemical

phenomena, and their application in such practical things as the lever, wheel and axle, inclined plane and pulley, pump, barometer, siphon, water-wheel, telegraph, etc. (*b*) The study of geography so presented that man's relation to the material world in his industrial, commercial, and governmental activities shall be clearly emphasized. (*c*) Exercises in drawing, which shall be the graphic representation of facts in regard to objects both real and imaginary, as well as the representation of their appearance, thus leading to working drawings. (*d*) Instruction in the use of hand tools in wood and metal, not for application in any particular trade or trades, but for developing skill of hand in the fundamental manipulations connected with the industrial arts, and also as a means of mental development.

In schools giving secondary instruction,— high schools and academies,— the proper adjustment of the industrial requirements to the existing course of study has yet to be worked out. This is the problem which practical business men are asking you, as educators, to solve. The industrial training should have no issue with the literary training. We have seen that both are needed in a sound course of mental training. Both are equally demanded by the social conditions of any highly organized community. That the purely literary training is not broad enough to answer as a higher educational

training for those who are to enter our ever-expanding industrial employments, which demand in a high degree the applications of natural science and also of skilled labor, is a fact which cannot be denied. To remedy this state of things secondary schools must provide a way to give broader instruction in experimental and theoretical science; and also, in a generalized form, instruction in manual training, including the use of hand and machine tools, not in its application in any special trade or trades, nor as a training divorced from general intellectual culture, but as an essential part of a sound general education.*

That the introduction of these features into the different grades of schools would necessitate changes in their present curricula is admitted;

---

* "We believe that scientific instruction ought not to stop with pure theory. We see a threefold advantage to be gained from this innovation,—for it is still an innovation; a physical advantage, for, in learning to make use of the plane, the saw, the hammer, and the lathe, the pupil will complete his gymnastic education, and will acquire a manual skill which will always be of use to him, whatever he may do later in life, and will prepare him for any apprenticeship; an intellectual advantage, for the thousand little difficulties which he will encounter will accustom him to observation and to reflection; and a social advantage, so to speak, for after having discovered from his own experience the qualities necessary to success as a skilled workman, there will be no fear that, however elevated the position for which fortune destines him, he will despise those of his fellow-beings who work with their hands."—*M. Paul Bert, in his report upon the new law for primary instruction in France.*

but it is believed that no important feature would be sacrificed, rather that all the valuable features of the present instruction would be greatly strengthened. The change would necessitate less drill in spelling, and in writing as a fine art; less drill in technical grammar and the details of geographical nomenclature; less puzzling over arithmetical conundrums,—in other words, fewer abstractions; on the other hand, the minds of pupils, brought into direct contact with material things and forces, and trained to give expression to thought by language and by the creative work of the hand, would be quickened and stimulated to self-activity in various directions; so that the mental power thus generated could more readily be trained to the proper use of language and number, and to the study of history, literature, etc., than by the use of abstractions alone. It has been abundantly shown that the development of mental power, by such means of generating and expressing thought as have been indicated, not only affords the best training for the practical duties of citizenship, but is also the best possible training for the development of thought in the higher departments of science, culture and philosophy.

To reach these results, two things are necessary:

First. The public must be shown the impor-

tance of the new methods and what is intended to be accomplished.

Second. Teachers must be trained to give the instruction.

Educators should lead the way.

The practicability of introducing the methods and the features we have been considering into our schemes of public instruction has been proved by experience in Europe and America. In our own country the kindergarten methods, now becoming better understood, are steps toward the training of the senses; here and there experimental lessons in physics and chemistry for primary and grammar classes have already been given with marked success, as for instance in the normal and training school at Salem, Mass., and at the Oswego Normal School; and drawing has become a more or less prominent feature in nearly all our schools. Although educators have been strangely inactive in forwarding and adopting these detached efforts, they have come almost unconsciously to accept them as desirable possibilities for the great education of the future, and are now introducing them under other names.

The introduction of training in the use of tools, however, seems to many people impracticable and revolutionary.* They forget, if they ever

* "Every advance in the use of tools means not merely an advance in producing power, but an advance in civiliza-

knew, that industrial training has become the great and successful sanative measure in the schools connected with reformatory institutions; that one of the most popular characteristics of the Indian schools at Hampton, at Carlisle, Penn., and in Oregon is the industrial training; and that various isolated but successful attempts have been made at combining manual with intellectual instruction in various schools, public and private, both in the East and the West. Thus we have the School of Mechanic Arts of the Institute of Technology, Boston, in which nine hours per week of the students' time are devoted to shop work, and the balance to drawing and other studies; the Manual Training School of Washington University, St. Louis, in the second year of its existence, with one hundred and one pupils, to whom it gives a three years' course in the use of tools, together with an ordinary English high school course (we are to have this afternoon a full account of the working of this school from its principal, Prof. C. M. Woodward); we have Professor Adler's Workingmen's School in New York, with one hundred and fifty pupils from six to fourteen years of age, each of

---

tion. You can read the history of the growth of human civilization in the history of tools, from the flint implement down to the last new complicated labor-saving appliances." —*Prof. S. P. Thompson.*

whom works four hours a week in clay, wood, or zinc, pursuing successfully at the same time the ordinary school branches; and we hear of classes in the industrial arts at Gloucester, Mass., at Jamestown, N. Y., and in the Dwight Grammar School in Boston.

Moreover, few among us are aware of the extent to which manual training has been adopted in Europe, particularly in Norway, Sweden, Finland,* Russia, Denmark, Austria, Germany, Holland, and France. While in England most of the experiments have been dictated by motives of philanthropy, on the Continent prominent educators have seriously considered and proved the value of the training from an educational point of view. In Germany, for instance, the cry to-day is, "Education *for* labor *through* labor." And although the movement only dates from 1879, the potency of the watchword, and the interest aroused among actual educators, led to the establishment of industrial courses in twelve of the larger towns in less than two years, and many other towns and villages have since followed suit. These courses are more or less closely connected with the school system, drawing their pupils for two hours a week from gymnasia and "real" schools alike, manual

* In Finland manual instruction has been compulsory since 1866, for boys from nine to fifteen years of age.

training being made an elective in many of the regular schools.*

In Sweden the experiment is on a still firmer basis. The instruction forms an integral part of the regular school curriculum, and is given in regular school shops attached to each school, each pupil spending about six hours per week in the shops in addition to the twenty-six or twenty-eight hours per week of regular instruction. The results have been most encouraging, although the shops were only built in 1879.†

In France, schools in which industrial training has been combined with elementary instruction

---

* In Germany much of the success of the movement is due to Herr Clausen von Kaas, who instituted a normal course at Emden, 1880, which was attended by sixty-two pupils. Most of these, aided by the local government, or by the industrial unions of their native towns, started school shops, or industrial classes, in the course of the ensuing year. Herr Clausen von Kaas has held a second successful course at Dresden, this summer, from which further good results may be expected.

† In Sweden, efforts are being successfully made to diffuse this education as generally as possible throughout the country. To this end, teachers are being trained in the endowed Normal Industrial School at Nääs; and normal courses of several weeks each are held yearly in the various districts, and are partly supported by the government, which also allows a certain stipend to each commune introducing manual instruction. Three hundred schools in twenty-three different districts, gave instruction in the manual arts in 1880; and in 1879, 127,000 kr. were spent in the promotion of the movement, exclusive of private gifts.

have been numerous, there being forty-two in Paris alone. One of the most successful, perhaps, is the École Communale, or public school, of the Rue Tournefort, in which industrial training was made an elective in 1871. Each pupil spends from one to four hours daily in the shop during a three-years' course, the pupils being from twelve to fifteen years of age. The practical success and popularity of this and similar experiments is shown by the incorporation in the new French code of education of a clause *requiring* that the use of tools be taught to all pupils in schools of the grade of our grammar schools.*

---

* M. Laubier, the director of the Rue Tournefort school, says in a recent letter: "You ask me, if the manual work harmonizes with the ordinary work? Far from interfering with the ordinary work, I can assure you, it offers valuable opportunities to teachers in vivifying, so to speak, their instruction; and it is also a most important aid in training pupils to comprehend what is explained to them. There are now forty-two schools in Paris where manual instruction is combined with pedagogic instruction. All the teachers agree in saying that they obtain good results, and that they have gained much under the new *régime* in order, care, and accuracy in work. I could quote a goodly number of our pupils who have distinguished themselves in the careers which they have chosen. What is really remarkable is that not a single one of them has changed his occupation; while changes are frequent among apprentices who have not been guided in their choice by school training." He also says that a course of industrial training for girls is being prepared.

The schools which have been mentioned by no means exhaust the list, but enough has been said to show that the introduction of manual instruction is no longer a problem; it is an actual and successful fact. Teachers of different countries unite in claiming from experience that manual instruction does not overcrowd and exhaust the children, but is of physical benefit to them; that it does not interfere with intellectual development, but rather sharpens and aids the mental faculties and proves of real educational value; that the expense, although varying in different localities, is by no means insuperable; and that these courses of instruction have already demonstrated their usefulness by sending out boys, young men, and young women, both willing and able to enter the ranks of skilled and lucrative labor.*

* The literature which has sprung up abroad on this subject is both considerable and important. The predominating tone, however, especially on the continent, is one of earnest devotion to the educational and social aspects of the reform, as distinguished from the economic aspects. The crying need of social reform has but to be mentioned to be appreciated in the midst of the social outbreaks which Europe has been witnessing during the last half-century; and it is perhaps this need which brings home the recommendations of the educational reformers of education for labor. It is not so much aggrandizement of the state which is sought, as it is peace within the state. The public is not urged to teach trades which shall make citizens valuable to the state from a commercial or an industrial point of view; but it is urged to

In conclusion, it may be said that all the evidence so far accessible not only goes to show that it is possible to incorporate the elements of industrial education, including instruction in manual training, in our system of public education; but also that its introduction will at the same time strengthen all sound methods of intellectual training.

Industrial education therefore becomes a most important matter of public concern. If what is claimed for it be true, its introduction will secure the harmonious development of the mental powers of our youth in the two directions of thinking and doing, and thus prepare them broadly for citizenship under a social order which requires the expression of thought by the skilled hand in labor, no less than by the use of writing. To bring our public education into harmony with the needs of our time, we must, through our schools, dignify and ennoble manual labor by making it the servant of thought as expressed by skill. Too long has there been a divorcement between training for manual labor and methods or means of intellectual training. Antagonisms between the literary employments and those connected with manual labor have consequently been developed. To remove these antagonisms by bringing the

---

educate each child into a contented, self-respecting member of society, healthy and well-balanced in mind and body, and capable of understanding the work of our present civilization.

instruction in our schools more into harmony with the requirements of labor in adult life is, therefore, not simply an educational or even an industrial question — it is one that lies at the foundation of all social questions.

DISCUSSION.

MR. JAMES MACALISTER, of Milwaukee, Wis., said: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: — I hardly can imagine why one from the far West should be asked to open this discussion, — except that it is the design of the committee to show that this new question — the newest question in education — is one which pertains to the whole country, and not to New England alone. And the argument in support of the report has been so full and so well guarded at all points, so complete in its statements and illustrations, that I hardly see what there is left for me to say, in opening the discussion. It would be easier, I think, a great deal, to hunt for some of the weak places in the argument, and attack them, than to amplify farther in support of what has been offered in support of the report. There are one or two things, however, that occur to me, that would serve, perhaps, to bring the matter rather more in the domain of the practical, and open the way for its discussion by teachers. And I want to say, in the beginning, — and I say it as an educator, — that I don't think there is any institution in the world so conservative as education. I believe the schoolmaster has moved the slowest and is the least disposed to go forward of any class of men devoted to any of the great

activities of life. About the same ideas have, until quite recently, dominated all our education, from the highest department to the lowest, and these ideas were born something like five hundred years ago. Education, like nearly all the great agencies of our modern culture and civilization, dates from the Renaissance, and the direction given to it at that time has largely obtained ever since. I need not state to this audience what that direction was. It might, perhaps, in one general term, be characterized as "the humanistic"; and the reasons are obvious. There are two great characteristics of that Renaissance,—the one the return to classical culture,—to antiquity,—and the other the restoration of nature to man, or man to nature, as you please. Now it is not at all surprising to us that the former of these should have gained the ascendancy, and cut off all possibility of any advance being made in the latter until something like two hundred years after the initial stage of the Renaissance. It was the revival of this ancient culture that laid the foundation of all our modern civilization; and we here, to-day, in discussing this matter of industrial education, do not want to forget that. What made the six hundred years of darkness was the absence of that classical culture,—the loss of it; and the only possibility of man's taking a new start and being restored to that higher stage of civilization which he had lost was the restoration of that culture. For something like seven or eight hundred years that culture was totally lost. The art of Greece, the philosophy of Greece, the literature of Greece, the laws and legislation of Rome, had been forgotten. As one author re-

marks: "For six hundred years in European history the Greek language was as unknown as the Sanscrit was until the end of the eighteenth century. And it was the restoration of this culture,—the restoration of man to nature,—that restored to him the consciousness of his own worth and dignity and greatness. It was that new birth called the Renaissance which gave rise to all that is great and beautiful and good in our modern civilization.

It is not at all surprising, then, that when men came to be able to read Homer again, and Sophocles, and Thucydides,—when men began to know Virgil as something different from a wizard, and to read Horace in the original, that they should have become so fascinated by the form of these works that the language, more than the substance, got hold of them and retained its hold. And in spite of this fact, that right at the beginning of the Renaissance there was this restoration to man of the consciousness of being a part of the greatness of nature, it was not until Bacon came, who laid the foundation of a new philosophy, the direct outgrowth of the Renaissance, that the other side of the movement, — the naturalistic, if you please, — the realistic, — either name you prefer, — had its foundation laid. The man who, perhaps, put into form those ideas of education that have ruled the world until the present time was, as you know, John Stürm, and that education was, as you know, purely humanistic. There was no exaggeration of nature in that system of education. And it became so important for the reformers to hold their own against the church, in whose bosom was born the humanistic culture, that they were compelled to base all their cul-

ture and all their education upon the same models. And so John Collet, at Oxford, and all the other great schoolmasters of France, Germany, and England commenced working in the same direction.

Now the foundation of this new form of education laid by Bacon was only made possible of attaining farther growth by the philosophy of Locke, which first of all treated the mind of man as a natural thing, — first of all showed man's relation to external nature, and first of all teachers, as I understand it, showed that man was to be educated through *contact with things*, and not simply by the influence of words.

Now, sir, I do not want to raise any philosophical issues here. I know better than that. I am too near to Concord to attempt anything of that kind. At the same time I want to say, as my own conviction on the matter, that all that is best on the one side of our education, — the side that is most coming into importance and which is that which we are discussing here to-day, is due to that philosophy.

So much, now, if you please, for the basis on which this rests. That philosophy, as you know, was first made known to the mass of men through two great teachers, — both teachers in the general sense, — through the writings of Rousseau and the work of Pestalozzi, referred to here to-day. And Pestalozzi it was who first sought to educate men through the perceptive faculties and train these perceptive faculties; and as the outcome of Pestalozzi we have, first of all, that greatest of all educational philosophers, Froebel himself.

Next, if you please, we have this question

facing us, as to what education really means. Now I think, so far as the ideal of education is concerned, there will not be any difference here to-day, as there would not be apt to be in any educational convention. The ideal of human education, as we understand it in the West, just as you do in the East, is the harmonious development of all man's powers. Now if the state is to control all of man's activities, if all that man does and all that man is are to be the creatures of the state,—if "paternalism," in other words, is to be set up as the highest form of human government, —that, I think, might be possible. But it strikes me that that is not the idea of a state which obtains in the world. It is rather the other side,—that the highest form of the civil community is that based upon individualism, and that the object of the state must be, so far as possible, to develop individualism, and therefore it must assume to regulate men as little as possible. Therefore it seems to me,—for that reason and also for the reason which has been shown here this morning so admirably,—that these productive employments are more and more monopolizing the great mass of men, from the necessities of modern society. All education must be adapted to the environment; and after all, this has been about the case all through the history of the world. Something was said here this morning, rather disparagingly, I thought, of Plato and Aristotle. Now we must not blame them at all for the ideas of education which they held. They taught the Greek idea of education, which consisted, as you know, in the proper understanding of music and gymnastics; and the

training in music and gymnastics ministered in the highest form to the development of the Athenian citizen; and therefore they were well and good in their places. But I think the point was well taken, if a little exaggerated, that these great thinkers and philosophers ought not to be allowed to dominate our existing education, and that education must be shaped very largely, and more and more with the passage of every year, to adapt men to their environment. Now the great mass of men are laborers. The great mass of men are bread-winners, and the education of these schools in America must be adapted to fit this mass of men for the work they are to do in the world. Take the public schools of Milwaukee, if you please. In the first grade of these schools there are forty-five per cent. of the entire enrollment. In the last grade, the "eight" grade, there are only about two per cent., — that is all. And taking the "eight" grade and the high school together, they would not form much over four per cent. of the total enrollment. That is not true of the eastern cities, I know, but I think that is a fair representation of the condition of things throughout the large western cities,— Chicago, St. Louis and other large cities in the West and Southwest. What becomes of those children? They have left school at ten years of age,— nearly all of them by twelve years of age, — to become workers, — boys and girls alike. I know that in the city of Boston the grammar schools form forty per cent. of the enrollment. I don't know how this question may seem to you, but with us we are beginning to realize more and more that the education of the public school must be adapted to the wants of this great mass of

children, and that these children, before they leave our schools at this early age, must have some sort of education to fit them for the life they are going to live in the world. Stand on Central Bridge in the city of Milwaukee at six o'clock in the evening, and see the thousands and thousands, not only of boys, but also of little girls, with their baskets in their hands, going home from their day's work. They left their humble homes at six o'clock in the morning; they had their luncheon with them, and at six o'clock they are on their way home. They have had all the education their parents could afford to give them. And therefore, as I say, this ideal form of education, although one that we all believe in, although one which perhaps I would concede as readily as any one here is the best adapted to fit the model citizen for the ideal state, will not do, after all, for the demands of the present time.

Now in saying this do not think I am raising any issue at all with this humanistic culture. I believe the world could not live without it. I believe that Homer and Plato and Thucydides are just as important to us here to-day, in this part of the nineteenth century, away off there in the western part of the continent, as the discoveries of Davy, or of Watt, or of Faraday. I do not see why there should be any issue between the industrial educators and the classical educators. I don't believe at all in this antagonism between science and classical culture. I don't understand it. I don't see why there should be any such antagonism. We have got to have the highly educated man to keep alive in our midst this grand old culture, this source of all that is

great and noble and beautiful in human life. I read the other day a remark, that may seem too strong, but it hardly strikes me as such, that outside of the blind forces of nature there is nothing that moves the world that is not Greek in origin; and I think it is about true. There is hardly anything to-day that ennobles us, outside of Christianity, that makes us grand, that makes us love what is beautiful and good, that did not come from that old Athenian democracy; and it will not do at all for the industrial educator, however enthusiastic he may be in adapting the education to fit those who ought to receive it, and who are entitled to receive it, to forget that this industrial culture would soon wither and fade, that these masses of humble men and women, the bread-winners, the laborers of the world, would soon themselves lose all the dignity of their nature, all the consciousness of moral worth that aggregates in the great body of humanity, if the inspiration that comes from these grand old nations were obliterated from our culture. [Applause.]

But it seems to me, ladies and gentlemen, that there is the practical question: What are you going to do with this great mass of young people who leave your schools before the possibility of their receiving this culture? I was told yesterday, by a friend of mine from the West, "Give them as much of this ideal culture as you possibly can. Cut off, if you please, at one quarter of it, one-eighth of it, one twenty-fifth of it. They are better off with that than they possibly can be with any other form of education." I do not believe it. When Senator Carpenter, the great Wisconsin Senator, went to Boston to study law,

he went to Rufus Choate and asked his advice as to whether he ought to devote himself to the study of the classical languages, as a means of fitting him for the forum and the bar, and Choate asked him, "How long can you afford to devote to the study of the Greek language?" Carpenter said he didn't know, but he hoped to be at the bar in three years from that time. "Young man," said the great lawyer, and great Greek scholar, too, "unless you can afford to give ten years of hard work, from your life, at this stage, all the time you can give in three years will be lost. You had better devote these three years to the study of Shakespeare and of Milton and of the Bible, and that will give you material and inspiration for your profession, and fit you to satisfy your highest ambition better than the learning of the alphabet of the classical languages, or what little you can learn within that time." I quote this because it comes from a man who was a great Greek scholar, who after his hard day's toil at the bar burnt the midnight oil that he might inspire his mind with the beauty of these old classic writers.

Now then that is the question: How shall you give to the education of these children that direction which shall fit them for the duties they are to assume? We in the West, where this question is not nearly so pressing as it is with you,— although I don't want you to think at all that you are going to be always allowed to do all the manufacturing of this country,— we have great industries growing up in the West, and the time is not so far distant as Massachusetts thinks when we will be independent in this respect, as in so many others; we are not going to be satisfied

all our lives to send you wheat in exchange for your industrial products, even of an artistic character; therefore there are growing up in Chicago, St. Louis, Milwaukee, Minneapolis,—away off on the prairies,—great industries, which are going to require children trained just as your children need to be trained and ought to be trained. And therefore this question is confronting us in Milwaukee to-day. And, as a means of beginning, we started at the foundation, with the kindergarten, because we thought, "there will be the best entering wedge." The school board of Milwaukee, not leaving it to private enterprise, but assuming the responsibility themselves, have just inaugurated a system of kindergartens, where every child in the city, of four years of age, shall receive that fundamental training which we hope will lead by and by to the application of the same methods all through our education, the high school included. I know there are difficulties in the way,— and these have been wisely avoided by the gentleman who read this paper. He says that is our business; and that is a very good way to get rid of it. He is right, however. It *is* our business; and the question is how we are going to solve the problem,—how we are going to overcome these difficulties. I think there will be no trouble about the introduction of such methods of manual training into these common schools, as we call them in the West,—the primary school, the schools below the high school,— as will accomplish the end desired. I think the methods here indicated are wise and practical,—that there shall be introduced into these schools a larger amount of natural-science teaching,—not of that kind of natural-

science teaching which looks so admirable upon the programme but when you come to the school amounts to nothing. You have seen in western school programmes elaborate outlines of science courses. If you should go West and visit those schools you would find that the whole thing resolved itself into this: That young women, the teachers in the class-rooms, have been burdened with this responsibility, and that there was not so much apparatus in their rooms as they could put in the crown of their bonnets,— the whole thing resulting in oral instruction, not of the kind we heard of, at the opening of the Institute, from Dr. Dickinson, but the wrong kind of oral instruction,— pouring into the scholars' minds a great amount of names and facts,— which is not science at all. But if into these primary schools could be introduced some simple forms of experiment in physics and chemistry, the two fundamental sciences, by some great mind,— not simply by the principal of the school, or the superintendent, if you choose, but by some great master in these sciences, one who understands what experiment is, and what it means to present this kind of instruction by the aid of a small amount of money, then the general features of science, and the comprehensive laws of the sciences, could be effectively illustrated, and this would be the means of laying the foundation for self-training in the application of these sciences in the simpler forms of machinery. I think the trouble would spring up when we came to the secondary schools,— which were given the "go-by" in this paper. There is where the trouble will come.

We in the West have no war with the high school. I believe in the high school. I believe

any system of public schools which has not a high school is defective in its vital part, and your common schools and primary schools will never amount to anything unless you have the high school to animate all the schools below, and regulate them, and give tone and character to the instruction all along the line. You have got to have these schools, because there will always be in the public schools a small number of boys and girls whose parents can afford to keep them in the high school and carry them through the course far enough to receive the full benefit of the instruction. Take the Milwaukee high school as a type of the larger number of Western high schools:— One hundred and fifty enter last September; how many graduate? Only thirty. That is true of nearly all the high schools of the West. Why so? Because the other hundred and twenty who entered were the sons and daughters of poor laboring people, and as soon as they found out, at the end of the second year, when two-thirds of them are gone, that this education was not going to be of much account to them in the vocation of life which they were sure to enter upon, they left and became laborers and apprentices and mechanics. That, now, is about the situation of things all through the West. But it seems to me that if along side of the high school,— I don't see clearly in my own mind how the high school is going to be modified to include this, but some of you may be able to tell us how it can be done,—if along side of the high school a manual training-school, succeeding the grammar school, as you call it here in the East, where the education of the boy,— and of the girl too,— why should not

she find a place there as well as the boy?— where the education of these in literary attainments shall be carried along, and languages and history taught, and by the elimination of such studies as are not essential to the sort of occupations the scholars are going to follow by and by, there shall be inserted some generalized form of manual training, that shall fit them, at the end of that three or four years' course, running parallel with the high school course, to enter in advance upon these industrial occupations, then it seems to me the whole problem will be solved. Cannot that be done? I believe it can. I listened the other day, in my own state, to the president of the Illinois Industrial University, who said that all this thing could not be done; that there were at least twenty different kinds of hammering, and that the only way to learn hammering was to learn them all,— that the learning of one did not help the learning of the others. Still I have got it in my mind that there is some generalized form of hammering, which, if I had learned it, would have fitted me all the more readily and quickly to adapt it to some one of those twenty. That is the way the matter appears to me. That is what it strikes me they are doing down in St. Louis, teaching the scholars to perform various operations required in the working of wood and the working of iron, and other forms of manual training: so they are fitting the boys, when they leave that school, to enter in advance upon some industrial occupation, and thus take the place of that decayed institution, once so important in industrial life, the apprentice;— I suppose it has disappeared in the

East as in the West. We have no longer apprentices; trades' unions have driven them out of the work shop,—will not allow them there,—and the result is that there are growing up within the limits of those trades immense numbers of men unskilled and wholly unfitted to do the work appointed them.

Now if in these schools the boys should be so carried along for three or four years that this apprenticeship period of life, as it was in former times, could be bridged over, and they started off in advance, say three or four years, in the special trade upon which they are to enter, it seems to me that this matter of industrial education could be adapted to school education without interfering with the highest culture which the humanistic form of education gives,—which is what you are insisting upon.

I merely want to say one word in conclusion, and it is this: That I think we teachers forget one thing,—don't misunderstand me now, I am the last man in this audience to undervalue knowledge, as such. I believe in knowledge. I believe that the dignity and the greatness of man require that, so far as possible, each man and each woman shall get all the knowledge that they possibly can, but after all, *skill* is of no small account to the great mass of men; and there are hundreds and thousands of men and women to whom skill is of more importance than knowledge, in its highest form. Why should not these public schools train these young people in skill as well as in knowledge? Why should not the hand be trained as well as the head,—not because the hand trains the head, but because the hand is the willing servant of the mind?

And it seems very strange that up to the time that this great German pedagogue, Froebel, put forth his system, the hand should have been neglected, which has done so much as the servant of the mind. What was it that rounded the dome of St. Peter's but the skill of the hand? What painted those pictures that we go across the sea to admire? What carves the statue in marble and bronze? What builds the ship that sails the sea? What constructs the steam-engine, which lies at the foundation of all our modern industry and wealth,—what but the skill of the hand of man? Why, then, should this hand, a part of man's nature which is the willing slave of the mind, be neglected; and why should not the school, just as much and as far as possible, consistently with the ends of the school, train the hand to become the cultivated servant of the mind, rather than the mere blunderbuss which it now is in the persons of so many thousands of our poorer population?

THE PRESIDENT: As we have heard an excellent address from the West, let us hear now from Dr. Dunton, of Boston.

REMARKS OF PROF. LARKIN DUNTON.

I will try, Ladies and Gentlemen, to confine my remarks to one practical point, upon which I know something, and omit the others. I don't think our education in this country is quite perfect, and it seems to me that I see one of the reasons for it, and that reason is: a change in the condition of a large number of the people. Years ago it was true all through New England, and was largely true farther than that, among the

early inhabitants, that they did know nature, as we do not know nature now. I have in mind now a young country boy; when he had grown up to be fourteen or fifteen years of age he had a knowledge of animals that was pretty extensive, — domestic animals. Those of you who have been farmer boys and are not too old to remember when you were young, will call up a long list of animals that the farmer boy became thoroughly acquainted with, in their habits and their uses. He became acquainted with a large class of wild animals; he knew their habits and their uses. He became acquainted with a large range of plant-life, — I was about to say domestic plants, — those useful plants, wheat, rye, oats, beans, barley, etc.; he became thoroughly acquainted with their habits, their growth, and their uses. And then there were the wild plants, the forests, and the flowers, — he had a very broad education in them, — in the direction of the observation of nature. I might add, too, that he had a knowledge of the mineral kingdom as well. Of course he did not know, what so many of the modern boys know, namely, the scientific names of the plants and minerals; but he knew, what I think is better than that, he knew *the things*.

Well, now, there is another respect in which that boy of the early times differed from the modern boy. He was a worker. Many of those young men, before they got settled down in active life, had actually made their own houses and made their own barns, and many of them had made the farming tools, scythes and plows, — all except the iron work, — rakes, forks, baskets, tubs, etc. And so I might go on with the list

for half an hour, of the tools, both farming and domestic, that had not only been observed but had actually been constructed; and, more than that, every one of them the farmer boy knew how to use,—many of them to his sorrow, but all of them to his education. I will not develop that thought any farther; I will leave it to have free scope in your imagination. I will say, on the other hand, that the introduction of steam has wrought quite a change in the habits of people, —a change very largely in the productive and manufacturing interests of the country, and very largely in the mode of its farming operations. Steam does the work that men, very largely, did before. As a result of this,—and there I leave your imaginations to trace it out, because I must keep within the five minutes assigned me,—there has been a very large increase in the congregation of people into our large cities. And what has been the result of this? This whole domain of observation and of practical doing has been taken away from most of the boys. In addition to this, the powers of their minds have been dissipated to an extent that the country boy knew nothing about. Only think of a country boy working for ten successive days in a single field of corn, where he studied nothing but the culture of corn from morning to night, and contrast him, in imagination, with the city boy, who meets with ten thousand objects of an artificial nature every day of his life. See what mental dissipation comes in the one case, and what concentration in the other. The result of all this has been a lack of real manly vigor in the mind of the boy brought up in the city, as compared with the

country boy. I was struck very forcibly, a little while ago, on getting at this fact: that of all the principals,—about fifty, I think,—of the public schools of the city of Boston, not one was born in the city of Boston. The same principle does not hold true in regard to the lawyers, but it is true of a great many of them. It is not so true of the physicians as of the clergymen. Now what I was going to say was, that these changed conditions demand changes in our modes of education; and I will only indicate, in very general terms, what it seems to me the changes are, viz.: That we ought to supply, so far as we can, in the city, the conditions under which the city boy will be able to get the observation, in the first place, which he is now very largely unable to get, from the mode in which we treat him, as a rule, in the cities. I will not develop that. Second,—and here is a very important point,—we need to make conditions such that somehow or other,—and *how* I will not attempt to touch upon at all,—the city boy will be taught to *do* something, to make something, to produce something, to fashion something,—not only to think of something that somebody else has made, at some time, for some purpose, but to think how he can make something himself that shall be good for something,—and that is the great thing. It seems to me that those two directions indicate the great field in which we ought, somehow, to work; in a word, we ought to change the condition so as to make efficient thinkers, efficient planners, and efficient doers of good work.

THE PRESIDENT: We have present with us the president of Washington University, of St.

Louis, Professor Woodward, whom I will next call upon.

REMARKS OF PROFESSOR WOODWARD.

The chairman speaks truly when he says that there is a great deal more to be said. It is dangerous for me to get on my feet when this subject is before the house. I have a great deal to say this afternoon, and yet there are one or two things I would like to say that I cannot say.

Now nothing could be more apropos than the remarks made upon this subject this morning. In what I shall say this afternoon I shall endeavor, to the best of my ability, to answer the important questions so clearly and forcibly raised by those remarks.

One thing upon which I wish to touch is the question of the inventions. The speaker last evening referred to the large number of inventions that came from the Eastern States and states where there is a great deal of public education. Now that is undoubtedly true; and yet these inventions in mechanical directions do not come from the highly educated, but from those who have had just an elementary education, and they do not come particularly in consequence of that education; they come without it. These inventors are able to express themselves by means of their education, but the inventions are very largely from those whose education has been limited to the very elements, and the powers which these men develop of themselves (not in the school-room), which enabled them to make these inventions, are the very ones you do not foster in the schools. You do not foster

the very things that people must learn before they can make wise inventions. A person who is a fine scholar makes an impracticable invention,—wastes his energies upon impracticable devices that come to nought. It is the man who begins at the bottom, and begins from the material side, who makes an invention which the world profits by. Now I am a great advocate of all kinds of education,— of the education of the head and of the hand. I believe in literature and in art. But I believe also in the practical side of education. Now when, in justification of our system of education and of the money we spend upon it, we appeal to our science and manufactures all over this country, we appeal to the very thing that we do not particularly cultivate. There is a sort of inconsequent relationship,— a *non sequitur*. I say, face your education about a little, or if you do not, build on a new face which shall look in that practical direction, and let the old one stand. It is all very well, as Mr. Macalister has wisely said, all there is in literature is good; I have not one word to say against it. I only do claim equal consideration for some other things.

One other point, and that is the growth of the mind while the hands are being cultivated. Now I have some practical observations to make upon that. Students under my charge, who are about of a rank with the others in the high school, have been at work with their hands daily. I shall give the programme more fully this afternoon,—I have only to say this: That the growth of their minds is none the less,—their growth in literature and mathematics is none the less be-

cause they spend two hours a day in learning the use of tools and the conditions of materials. We don't lose anything on that side because we incorporate the other. Then on another point: He speaks of boys who have a very short course at school. Now a great many boys in my school would not be at school at all if it were not for mine. When my school was opened they were intending to leave school. They had finished their education in the grammar school and were going to work, when they saw the course laid down in the manual training at my school. Then they said, "We will go to that school one, two, or three years,"—and they will gain time by it in their trades.

Another thing. All the boys who write good compositions expect to be professional men, clerks, book-keepers, etc. Now I happened to take account of stock the other day in my school, to know what the boys proposed to do. Now they had not been neglecting their literature,—because that was the only study I personally taught in the school. I did it in order to emphasize that branch,—because we know how apt people are to drift away over on to the other side. The only class I taught was the class in English literature. Those boys testified as to what they were going to do in somewhat the same way. They are going to be machinists and engineers, about half of them. They still go on with their history and algebra and drawing and literature, and all they get in that direction as well as on the mechanical side, is just so much added to their education. They would have got nothing more if it had not been for that school.

REMARKS OF C. C. CARPENTER, ESQ.

If we will go back fifty years, Mr. President, we will find that an entirely new civilization has come to this country,—a civilization based upon the employment of the energy of nature for the benefit of the human race. In 1832 what did the world know of the laws of force. It was not until 1847 that Jules' great law was proclaimed. The inventor was nothing but an experimenter. Peter Cooper, when he constructed his first little engine to run on a railroad out of Baltimore, was wholly an experimenter. George Stephenson, in England, was wholly an experimenter. There was not a machinist, from that time up to 1850, when Jules' law became known,—not a machinist in the world but was an experimenter. When you take the industrial progress of the world into account, whether in England or the United States, or in any other country, it has all been based upon the civilization that has come in with the introduction of steam and the use of the forces of nature for the benefit of the human race.

Now it is all very delightful to go back to Plato and Aristotle. The world needs them to-day, as it has needed them in all the past. But the world needs to-day, as it never has needed before, the principles which underlie all human progress and which the Almighty has given to us in the forces of nature. And, therefore, when we come down to this question of industrial training and manual-labor schools, the training of the hand, the training of the eye, the training of the intellect in connection with them, you come to what lies at the base of all the progress of this country, especially in the future.

I have spoken of the use of the energy of nature. Now the question has been raised here, or it has been alluded to, and the question has been brought into some of the schools, as to "what is my education fitting me for?"— a question raised, I think, by the Boston *Herald*. Now what do the boys in the schools of this country know to-day as to what they are to do? I was delighted to hear the last speaker say that a large number of boys in his school were to be engineers. The time has come when the great pecuniary prizes of life do not lie in the liberal professions, but they lie in the mechanic arts. You go down to the works of the Pennsylvania Railroad and you will find there masters of machinery receiving a salary of twenty thousand dollars a year; on the Union Pacific Railroad, fifteen thousand dollars a year. The great corporations are ready to pay the largest sum a man will ask if he will render them the services they want. I was conversing with a manufacturer in Lawrence, Mass., a gentleman who is engaged in the dye-works connected with one of the great manufacturing corporations there, who receives a salary of ten thousand dollars a year simply for studying the qualities and uses of dye-stuffs. Therefore, I say that the great prizes of the future lie in the training of these boys for mechanical pursuits,—and not only of the boys, but of the girls also in the same line,— and it gives me pleasure to stand here and say that the valedictory at the Institute of Technology at Boston, a few years ago, was taken by a young lady, and to give you the words of Mr. Edward Atkinson, "the thesis which she gave on the chemistry of the cotton plant has alone

secured her fortune." It gives me pleasure to mention this, in connection with the question you had up yesterday in regard to the higher education of woman, that that young lady, twenty-four years of age, has gone through the entire course of the Institute of Technology in Boston, and has paid her board-bills and other expenses all the time, and come out and taken the valedictory. I am very happy to say that she is my own niece. So when you come down to this great question and take in all its points, and recognize the truth that the civilization of to-day is based upon the employment of the energy of nature, you get at the root of all of the education for the masses, for the future,—that you must train them to come in contact with this energy of nature. I will not undertake here to say how that shall be done; but it seems to me that it cannot be done in the high school, but that you must have special schools. You must begin down at the lowest school and train them up to the grammar school, and then come to the branch industrial school, and complete their education in that line.

THE PRESIDENT: We will now invite Dr. E. E. White, of Indiana, to speak to us for a few minutes.

REMARKS OF DR. E. E. WHITE.

It is a matter of no concern to this audience what my position may be; but that I may not be misunderstood in what I am to say it seems proper that I should here state that I stand at the head of a college of science and industry, with three great departments, of agriculture, in-

dustrial art, and mechanics,—leading to mechanical and civil engineering, and that my life work is in this direction; so that I have, certainly, from my position, nothing that would lead me to antagonize the paper that has been read or the remarks that have been made. But when I entered upon the work of technical and scientific education I covenanted with myself that in its advocacy I would never undermine the great system of public education in the United States; that I would not bring to my aid that which would certainly undermine public confidence in the practical value of our school work. And so I rise this morning to discuss this paper, not taking the least exception to what has been urged in it respecting the way of putting into our public schools so much of manual training,—or, speaking more properly, so much of hand training and of eye training,—as will contribute to the better education of these young people in the public schools. I am not prepared to say that I can accept the fourth measure of the gentleman who prepared the paper; but of course I could take no exception to all that may be said in favor of technical and industrial schools, standing beside the public schools and carrying on this work of education,—giving to our youth technical and special training for industrial pursuits. That is what we have got to do in this country. We must have a system of technical training, and the question is: Shall we put a system into the public schools, as they are now organized?

Now it seems to me that the paper which was read this morning is based on a philosophy that is destructive to public education in the United

States. Now that is a pretty bold statement; but let me say, my friends, that if you accept the philosophy of that paper, I do not see as you have anything to do in the future but when Richard Grant White attacks your public schools to surrender and surrender unconditionally,—a philosophy that saps the very foundation on which the public school system rests, and puts a magazine under it, in its different parts, and then lays a train out, to fire it. The person who does that need not, certainly, blame the outsider if with his little spark he touches that train, and if your public school system, in some of its important departments, is blown up before your eyes, you need not be startled; you put the magazine under it yourself.

Now the whole argument, so far as I understand it, proceeds upon this supposition: that the school is the only agency for the education of a human being, and that the public school is the only school that has been provided, or ought to be provided, to do this comprehensive work. Then you must start with the human brain, and its outlets through the human body, and hold your public school responsible for the complete education of that organism, taking it from a material standpoint, from the cradle to the end. But, from the days of Aristotle to this hour, no one, it seems to me, can have failed to realize that there are at least four great agencies for the education of a human being, provided by the Creator of that human being, and as universal in their application as the human race. Right beside that child in the cradle, stand the father and the mother, God's vicegerents upon earth, if I may use a strong expression, for the proper

training of that child; and the four, five, or six years, it may be, of that child's early life, in which the important work of education is done, is done by the family. And the work of education is only taken up in the public schools, and that, too, much narrower than the family gave it. Then over against that cradle stands the social community in which that child is born, who are also, under God, responsible in a measure for the education of that child. And so there comes to his life, in every direction, in work, in play, in social contact with other children, in all the relations of this social organism, vital and most valuable educational training. And then there stands the church, ordained of God for the education of the human soul, and its salvation,— taking that child from its cradle, through the father and the mother, and through other influences, and breathing into its life constantly those influences that must shape its life. Now to hold the public school,— which is the state standing by that cradle, in its agency, responsible for all the neglect and all the defects of these other agencies, in their training, is simply to hold your public school responsible for that which it cannot meet for one hour, and whenever the public assails it as responsible you cannot defend it: there is nothing to be done but to surrender.

Any advocacy, then, of industrial training that ignores these three other agencies in the education of a child, or any training that puts the public school to the task of covering the province of the whole, will fail.

Now there is another fallacy that underlies that paper, which is fundamentally this: That

the true end to be kept in view by the teacher in the training of a child in the public school,— for I take it the paper was confined to public education, that that was what it aimed at; if not I am talking all at random,— that the aim of the public teacher is to prepare this child to do something in life, to work with its hands and earn its bread and clothing, and build houses and carry on other industrial pursuits, that the leading purpose of the teacher, in his sublime office, is to prepare the child for the work of life. Now Aristotle never committed that blunder. But that grand philosopher put before us as the aim of every educational process, *man*,—the human soul,— man, above his work,— man, the supreme end, —the human soul and its culture the sublime purpose of general education. Now subordinate to that is man's work. No one would wish to say we should lose sight of the fact that this boy is to work. Of course the family has not lost sight of that. The social community has not lost sight of it. And we are not to lose sight of it. But whenever you subordinate public education to the trades and occupations of life, you reverse its great purposes and subordinate its highest end to that which is lowest. The idea that the children of labor are to be educated for labor, which was quoted in the paper, is a doctrine which every American should scout, from the bottom of his soul. That will do for Europe; but let me say that we should be very careful how we copy our educational methods from Europe. In Europe the child of labor (I care not whether it is in France or wherever it may be; in France republicanism has not risen high enough to overcome it), is looked upon as the drudge of society, as the tool

of the upper classes, as the machine which the middle class and the upper class are to use to contribute to their own good; and hence, of course, they educate the child of labor with sole reference to making him a good workman, and never realizing that that child is to be a man and a citizen. And no philosophy of education that does not realize the fact that every human soul has, as his supreme birth-right,— whether the man is to work in the shop or to stand in legislative assemblies,— has as his supreme birth-right the right to be unfolded, enriched, developed as a man, — I say any theory that ignores that fact is fundamentally un-American, and contrary to all our ideas. Thank God, we have no caste in this country, and the children of our schools may rise or fall according to their power and merit, just as drops of water of unequal temperature can glide by each other. We have not got "horizontally visioned" here in America yet, and while we educate a child for labor incidentally, let us ever remember that we educate that child supremely that he may be a man.

Now, my friends, I have said this strongly, simply because I wish that all our friends who are advocating industrial education would change their base and would put their arguments and their demands on grounds that would leave our public school system in public confidence and in public esteem. For if the work which we have been doing in this country for two hundred years has not made better workmen, has not made better artists, has not made better inventors, has not contributed to all the interests of society, productive, distributive, governmental, or educative, —if it has not done this and done it richly,—

then let me say that all your little devices of putting in a little tool-training, and a little this and a little that, into the public schools, never will meet the condition of things. You have got to rely in the end on this fundamental training, by the public school, in its present office and function. You may modify it some; but if this you are to assail and undermine, then the next step in that argument is that "If this education is so largely a failure you have no right to tax me to support it." But it is not a failure. Look over your list of inventions and inventors in Massachusetts. How many technical schools has Massachusetts had,—how many technical industrial schools,—out of which these inventors have come? Very few; but they have come out of the common schools of New England, out of her colleges, that have developed thought, have developed brain power,—out of these have come these inventors, that are touching the earth and making it glad,—that are touching our mountains and they are pouring out oil and wine. It is this that is the power. The truth is, that the most true result of education is thought. That is the alchemy that is turning everything it is touching in this land into gold. Thought, too, in the brain of labor is the one condition on which American industry can rest.

REMARKS OF PROF. LARKIN DUNTON.

I want to say just one word there, and that is that it seems to me that there is one fallacy underlying the remarks of the gentleman who has just spoken, and that is this: The assumption that it is not necessary for children to be fed and

clothed in order to grow to be men; and I hold it to be a fundamental law that first, before you can be a man and be useful to other men, you must have the means of living. Hence I say that any system of education which does not fit our children to earn their bread and butter and clothing, does not do the work that we have a right to demand of our public school system.

REMARKS OF MR. A. P. MARBLE, OF WORCESTER.

After the most excellent paper that was read, propped up by several excellent addresses, all on one side, I began to think it was time for me to be heard. I was going to interrupt the reader, when I found my friend Mr. White was on the same side with me.

Now I think there is a fallacy which underlies the position of the last speaker. His fallacy is in assuming that Mr. White's position does not prepare a boy for earning his living. He begs the question when he says that this boy must earn his living and therefore he must have industrial training of an educational form. I say the boy must have his living; therefore he must have industrial education in some other form. The course of the discussion made me think of the revival meetings where it always seemed to me that one side always had its own way, and nobody could speak on the other side;— the devil never could have a fair chance. I don't claim to be his representative here; but if you read *Paradise Lost*, you find some things about him, as he is represented there, which cannot but be admired. We industrial education people come together here, and we resolve,

as a certain religious assembly once did, first that the earth is the Lord's, secondly that the Lord has given it to His saints, and thirdly that we are the saints. That is about the position that the industrial education people take here. We school-teachers come here and say that we are "educato-r-r-s,"— spelled with two "r's," rolled under the tongue, and we assume everything whatever on earth in regard to the bringing up of a child. We have our kindergartens, and we want to take the baby before he has done nursing. Then we have our social scientists who want to reform and reconstruct society from the very foundation. Then we want all the mechanical arts brought in, and the school made responsible for the whole thing, and we, "the saints," are going to monopolize and manipulate this whole creation of God and be responsible for man here and hereafter. It seems to me that it is time to confine ourselves to our constitution, and recognize what Mr. White has so well said, that there are other institutions engaged in the work of education, besides ours; to recognize the fact that the mother is the best "kindergarten" that ever was, and was made for that very purpose, and that when you educate her into something else, so that there are no mothers, then our work will be done. It is a short solution of the whole problem. I was talking with a friend, the other day, in regard to the matter of conferring degrees upon women as well as men,— Bachelors and "Maidens" of Arts, etc.,— and he proposed a solution of the degree question, which seemed to me very good, and as he is a bashful man and will not say it himself, I want to put it in here on this branch

of the question,—that if we give Bachelor's degrees to men and confer Doctor's degrees and Master's degrees upon those who have distinguished themselves in the line for which they are best fitted, that above all, the mother of the Master or the Doctor should have a degree for being the mother and the trainer of a great man or woman.

Now it seems to me that we have a school for the purpose of training the minds of the young, and that it is wholly fallacious,—I agree with everything that has been said here, in a modified, homœopathical form,—that it is wholly fallacious to talk about educating the hand. My hand is as good as anybody's hand,—and is better for me. I don't believe that hand can be educated. It is *mind* that is educated. If the mind were educated in the right direction, the hand would play the violin or organ, or paint or draw. Of course, we have got to train the mind through the hand. When we talk about "object teaching," "industrial training," we think we are training these bodies. Where will these bodies be one hundred years hence? They will not be anywhere. We are in reality training the mind. Now the schools we have to conduct are to train boys and girls in those directions that are common to everybody, and one of the things that the boys and girls ought to learn in these schools is how to get information from books. There is no information stored up in the plough, hoe-handle, steam-engine; but there *is* information stored up in books. If a boy is prepared to get information from books he can make indefinite progress. If you take out of his hand the books and put in

there the hand-saw and the hammer, and ask the teacher,— who is most likely a young girl,— to teach them, when she does not know anything about them, the whole matter will simply become "a bore" to all parties concerned. The saw is brought into the recitation-room, and the teacher says "now saw." It is a thing that does not belong to the school at all. It belongs outside, and ought to be attended to outside.

REMARKS OF DR. J. H. HOOSE.

I think that Dr. White's position is subject to query from this standpoint: His idea that the schools can do only such and such things assumes that society is controlled by one of the institutions which it has created,—which is fallacious. Society has the right, the inalienable right, to create institutions for such purposes as shall serve its interests. Therefore, if the state sees it for its advantage to institute schools, of whatever character, it has the right to do so.

DR. WHITE: The gentleman either misunderstood me or I lacked clearness. No one questions the proposition that the gentleman enunciates; and if you will read the report I made last year before the National Association, on this subject, printed by the National Bureau, you will find that that question I discussed freely. The state has the right to put into the public school that kind of training which the family and society may do. But is it *obliged* to put into the public school the training that those agencies might cover? That is the question. We have put into it just whatever we can put in without destroying the function of the school,

and you cannot hold the public school responsible for covering the whole domain of education.

MR. STONE: I move to lay this subject on the table.

The motion was carried, by a vote of 60 in the affirmative to 20 in the negative.

VII.

*THE EDUCATION OF THE WILL.**

By Prof. G. Stanley Hall, Ph. D., of Harvard University.

A CHIEF characteristic of contemporary psychology is to reduce most of the activities of the soul to some form of will. The more popular sayings of Schopenhauer, that the normal man is two-thirds will and only one-third intellect; of F. W. Robertson, that doing is an essential organ of knowing; of Matthew Arnold, that conduct is three-fourths of life; or of Maudsley, that both history and character are written in the habits of muscles, which constitute about one-half of the human body, and are preëminently the organs of the will — these now seem to many not more but less than the truth. We are told that belief is a function, or a part, or even a product of deliberated activity, that thought is repressed action, that attention is inner will, that reason is not only dominated by the will to think, but that thought-laws are no

* Published in the *Princeton Review*, November, 1882.

less necessarily will-laws, and sometimes that the aimless drift of all associative thinking, and even reverie, owes the impulse by which it passes from one notion to the next to a "spontaneous will." Not only is logic subordinated to ethics, and the intellect, even its lower perceptive activities, reduced to practical activity, or motor innervation, but even the impulsive side is no less subordinated to will. Desire, we are told, is one concept getting ahead of the rest in the struggle for the highest clearness, and ripening into volition as the rest are more or less completely overcome. So, too, wishes, interests which perform the will and which must be carefully studied and inventoried in children as its prelusory forms, or as the forefeelings of not only their capacities but of their destinies, and even feeling, Wundt argues, is a process in the development of will.* Thus, instead of Cicero's *vivere est cogitare*, we might now say *vivere est velle*.

With all this we are not here concerned, save to

* See in this line, as perhaps the best of the Herbart-Beneke pedagogical literature, the excellent work of Dressler, Ueber das Wesen, u. Bildung des Menschlichen Willens, in Diesterwegs Jahrbuche, 1861. Also Dittes: Naturlehre des Moralischen, u. Kunstlehre der Moralischen Erziehung. Leipzig, 1858. And Dr. F. M. Wendt, Die Willensbildung. Leipzig, 1875. C. Habel, Entwickelungs-geschichte des Willens. Leipzig, 1882. As well as in the general pedagogic treatise of Waitz, Strümpel and Kern.

point out a tendency of contemporary thought congenial to a practical country like our own, and of special import for teachers. We raise here no speculative issue, even with those who prefer to regard the will as a finished innate faculty, or as transcendental or noumenal, as substance, prototype, matter of all things, supporting the intellect, which is only accident, ectype, form, "as a stout blind beggar carries a dwarfed and crippled but seeing one," and its every act an absolute beginning. All we say is that, so far as the will of an individual in action may be regarded as made of, or even conditioned by, consolidated traces or residua of past volitions, so that in a sense we will with all we have willed, and in a direction which is the resultant of actual ideo-motor experience, so far its laws of growth may be best observed, and later best applied. Central as the will is now regarded, from whatever standpoint, a practical difference between it and the intellect is so distinct that even the three R's must, save in ideal schemes, long be taught in different ways as the one or the other is made the chief object of education. Indeed, the intellect may be so trained as to enfeeble and dissipate the will, and it is because this is so widely seen and felt that it has come to be one of the chief endeavors of educational thought to-day to go deeper and to moralize as well as to mentalize children, and to develop will as a chief fac-

tor of character; a word which meant in the original Greek, first a dye or tool to stamp with, then the mark left by it, then fixed, reliable traits.*

From its nature, too, as well as from its central importance, it might be easily shown, were there space, that the will is no less dependent on the culture it receives than the mind. It is fast becoming as absurd to suppose men can survive in the great practical strain to which American life subjects all who would succeed if the will is left to take its doubtful chances of training and discipline, as to suppose the mind develops in neglect. Our changed conditions make this chance of will-culture more doubtful than formerly. A generation or two ago most school-boys had either farm-work, chores, errands, jobs self-imposed, or required by less tender parents; they *made* things, either toys or tools, out of school. Most school-girls did house-work, more or less of which is, like farm-work, perhaps the most varied and most salutary as well as most venerable of all schools for the youthful body and mind. They undertook extensive works of embroidery, bed-quilting, knitting, sewing, mending, if not cleaning, and even spinning and

* As to the meaning of the word "character," see suggestive remarks in Dr. A. Hagemann's brochure, Was ist Charakter u. wie kann es durch die Erziehung gebildet werden? Leipzig, 1881.

weaving their own or others' clothing, and cared for the younger children. The wealthier devised or imposed tasks for will-culture, as the German crown prince has his children taught a trade as part of their education. Ten days at the hoe-handle, axe, or pitchfork, said an eminent educator lately in substance, with no new impression from without, and one constant and only duty, is a schooling in perseverance and sustained effort, such as few boys now get in any shape; while city instead of country life brings so many new, heterogeneous and distracting impressions of motion rather than rest, and so many privileges with so few corresponding duties, that with artificial life and bad air the will is weakened, and eupeptic minds and stomachs on which its vigor so depends are too rare. Machines supersede muscles, and perhaps our athleticism gives skill too great preponderance over strength, or favors intense rather than constant, long-sustained, unintermittent energy. Perhaps too many of our courses of study are better fitted to turn out many-sided but superficial paragraphists, than men who can lay deep plans, and subordinate many complex means to one remote end. Meanwhile, if there is any one thing of which our industries and practical arts are in more crying need than another, it is the old-fashioned virtue of thoroughness, of a kind and degree which does not address merely the eye, is not limited

by the letter of a contract, but which has some regard for its products for their own sake, and some sense for the future. Whether in science, philosophy, morals, or business, the fields for long-ranged cumulative efforts are wider, more numerous, and far more needy than in the days when it was the fashion for men to contentedly concentrate themselves to one vocation, life-work, or mission, or when cathedrals or other yet vaster public works were transmitted unfinished but ever advancing from one generation of men to another.

But great as is the need the practical difficulties in the way are very great. First, there are not only no good text-books, but no good manuals to guide teachers. Some give so many virtues or good habits to be taught per term, ignoring the unity of virtue as well as the order in which the child's capacities for real virtue unfold. Advanced text-books discuss the grounds of obligation, the nature of choice or freedom or the hedonistic calculus, as if pleasures and pains could be balanced as measurable quantities, etc., so that philosophic morality is clearly not for children or teachers. Secondly, evolution encourages too often the doubt whether virtue can be taught when it should have the opposite effect. Perversity and viciousness of will are too often treated as constitutional disease, and insubordination or obstinacy, especially in school, are se-

cretly admired as strength, instead of being vigorously treated as crampy disorders of will, and the child is coddled into flaccidity. Because the lowest develops first, there is danger that it will interfere with the development of the higher, and thus, if left to his own, the child may come to have no will. The third and greatest difficulty is, that with the best effort to do so, few teachers can separate morality from religious creed. So vital is the religious sentiment here that it is hard to divorce the end of education from the end of life, proximate from ultimate grounds of obligation, or finite from infinite duties. Those whose training has been more religious than ethical can hardly teach morality *per se* satisfactorily to the *noli me tangere* spirit of denominational freedom so wisely jealous of conflicting standards and sanctions for the young.

How then can we ever hope to secure proper training for the will? Two ways suggest themselves: First, we may try to assume, or tediously enucleate a consensus of religious truth as a basis of will training, *e.g.*, God and immortality, and, ignoring the minority who doubt these, vote them into the public school. Pedagogy has nothing whatever to say respecting the absolute truth or falsity of these ideas, but there is little doubt that they have an influence on the will, at a certain stage of average development, greater and more essential than any other; so great that

even were their vitality to decay like the faith in the Greek or German mythology, we should still have to teach God and a future life as the most imperative of all hypotheses in a field where, as in morals, nothing is so practical as a good theory; and we should have to fall to teaching the Bible as a moral classic, and cultivate a critical sympathy for its view of life. But this way ignores revelation and supernatural claims, while there are other objections to emancipating or "rescuing" the Bible from theology just yet. Indeed, the problem how to teach anything that the mind could not have found out for itself, but that had to be revealed, has not been solved by modern pedagogy, which, since Pestalozzi, has been more and more devoted to natural and developing methods. The latter teaches that there must not be too much seed sown, too much or too high precept, or too much iteration, and that, in Jean Paul's phrase, the hammer must not rest on the bell, but only tap and rebound, to bring out a clear tone. Again, a consensus of this content would either have to be carefully defined and would be too generic and abstract for school uses, or else differences of interpretation, which so pervade and are modified by character, culture, temperament, and feeling, would make the consensus itself nugatory. Religious training must be specific at first, and, omitting qualifica-

tions, the more explicit the denominational faith the earlier religious motives may affect the will.

This is the way of our hopes, to the closer consideration of which we intend to return in the future, though it must be expected that the happiest consensus will be long quarantined from most schools. Meanwhile a second way, however unpromising, is still open. Noble types of character may rest on only the native instincts of the soul or even on broadly interpreted utilitarian considerations. But if morality without religion were only a bloodless corpse or a plank in a shipwreck, there is now need enough for teachers to study its form, drift, and uses by itself alone. This, at least, is our purpose in considering the will, and this only.

. . . . . .

The only duty of small children is habitual and prompt obedience. Their will, purpose, and even mood when alone is fickle, fluctuating, contradictory. Our very presence imposes one general law on them, viz., that of keeping our good will and avoiding our displeasure. As the plant grows towards the light, so they unfold in the direction of our wishes, felt as by divination. They respect all you smile at, even buffoonery; look up in their play to call your notice, to study the lines of your sympathy, as if their chief vocation was to learn your desires. Their early lies are often saying what they think will please

us, knowing no higher touchstones of truth. If we are careful to be wisely and without excess happy and affectionate when they are good, and saddened and slightly cooled in manifestations of love if they do wrong, the power of association in the normal eupeptic child will early choose right as surely as pleasure increases vitality. If our love is deep, obedience is an instinct if not a religion. The child learns that while it cannot excite our fear, resentment or admiration, etc., it can act on our love, and this should be the first sense of its own efficiency. Thus, too, it first learns that the way of passion and impulse is not the only rule of life, and that something is gained by resisting them. It imitates our acts long before it can understand our words. As if it felt its insignificance, and dreaded to be arrested in some lower phase of its development, its instinct for obedience becomes almost a passion. As the vine must twine or grovel, so the child comes unconsciously to worship idols, and imitates bad patterns and examples in the absence of worthy ones. He obeys as with a deep sense of being our chattel, and at bottom admires those who coerce him, if the means be wisely chosen. The authority must, of course, be ascendancy over heart and mind. The more absolute such authority the more the will is saved from caprice and feels the power of steadiness. Such authority excites the unique, unfathomable

sense of reverence, which measures the capacity for will-culture, and is the strongest and soundest of all moral motives. It is also the most comprehensive, for it is first felt only towards persons, and personality is a vinculum, enabling any number of complex elements to act or be treated as a whole, as everything does and is in the child's soul, instead of in isolation and detail. In the feeling of respect culminating in worship, almost all educational motives are involved, but especially those which alone can bring the will to maturity; and happy the child who is bound by the mysterious and constraining sympathy of dependence, by which, if unblighted by cynicism, a worthy mentor directs and lifts the will. This unconscious reflection of our character and wishes is the diviner side of childhood, by which it is quick and responsive to everything in its moral environment. The child may not be able to tell whether its teacher often smiles, dresses in this way or that, speaks loud or low, has many rules or not, though every element of her personality affects him profoundly. His acts of will have not been *choises*, but a far greater mass of psychic causes than consciousness can estimate have laid a basis of character, than which heredity alone is deeper, before the child knows he has a will. These influences are not transient but life-long, for if the conscious and intentional may anywhere be said to be only

a superficial wave over the depths of the unconscious, it is in the sphere of will-culture.

But command and obedience must also be specific to supplant nature. Here begins the difficulty. A young child can know no general commands. "Sit in your chair," means sit a moment, as a sort of trick, with no prohibition to stand the next instant. Any just-forbidden act may be done in the next room. All is here and now, and patient reiteration, till habit is formed, and no havoc-making rules which it cannot understand or remember, is our cue. Obedience can, however, be instant even here, and is its chief virtue, and there is no more fear of weakening its will by it than in the case of soldiers. As the child grows old, however, and as the acts commanded are repugnant or unusual, there should be increasing care, lest authority is compromised, sympathy ruptured, or lest mutual timidity and indecision, if not mutual insincerity and dissimulation, as well as parodied disobedience, etc., to test us, result. We should, of course, watch for favorable moods, assume no unwonted or preternatural dignity or owlish air of wisdom, and command in a low voice which does not too rudely break in upon the child's train of impressions. The acts we command or forbid should be very few at first, but inexorable. We should be careful not to forbid where we cannot follow an untrusty child, or what we cannot pre-

vent. Our own will should be a rock and not a wave. Our requirements should be uniform, with no whim, mood, or periodicity of any sort about them. If we alternate from caresses to severity, are fickle and capricious instead of commanding by a fixed and settled plan, if we only now and then take the child in hand, so he does not know precisely what to expect, we really require the child to change its nature with every change in us, and well for the child who can defy such a changeable authority, which not only unsettles but breaks up character anew when it is just beginning to inspissate. Neglect is better than this, and fear of inconsistency of authority makes the best parents often jealous of arbitrariness in teachers. Only thus can we develop general habits of will and bring the child to know general maxims of conduct inductively, and only thus by judicious boldness and hardihood in command can we bring the child to feel the conscious strength that comes only from doing unpleasant things. Even if instant obedience be only external at first, it will work inward, for moods are controlled by work, and it is only will which enlarges the bounds of personality.

Yet we must not forget that even morality is relative, and is one thing for adults and often quite another for children. The child knows nothing of absolute truth, justice, or virtues. The various stimuli of discipline are to enforce

the higher though weaker insights the child has already unfolded, rather than to engraft entirely unintuited good. The command must find some ally, feeble though it be, in the child's own soul. We should strive to fill each moment with as little sacrifice or subordination as mere means or conditions to the future as possible, for fear of affectation and insincerity. But yet the hardier and sounder the nature, the more we may address training to barely nascent intuitions, with a less ingredient of immediate satisfaction, and the deeper the higher element of interest will be grounded in the end. The child must find as he advances towards maturity, that every new insight or realization of his own reveals the fact that you have been there before with commands, cultivating sentiments and habits, and not that he was led to mistake your convenience or hobby for duty, or failed to temper the will by temporizing with it. The young are apt to be most sincere at an age when they are also most mistaken, but if sincerity be kept at its deepest and best, error will be least harmful and easiest overcome. If authority supplant rather than supersede good motives, the child will so love authority as to overcome your reluctance to apply it directly, and as a final result will choose the state and act you have pre-formed in its slowly-widening margin of freedom, and will be all the less liable to undue subservience to priest or

boss, or fashion or tradition later, as obedience gives place to normal, manly independence.

In these and many other ways everything in conduct should be mechanized as early and completely as possible. The child's notion of what is right is what is habitual, and the simple, to which all else is reduced in thought, is identified with the familiar. It is this primitive stratum of habits which principally determines our deepest beliefs—which all must have over and above knowledge—to which men revert in mature years from youthful vagaries. If good acts are a diet and not a medicine, are repeated over and over again, as every new beat of the loom pounds in one new thread, and a sense of justice and right is wrought into the very nerve-cells and fibres; if this ground texture of the soul, this "memory and habit-plexus," this sphere of thoughts we oftenest think and acts we oftenest do, is early, rightly and indisceptibly wrought, not only does it become a web of destiny for us, so all-determining is it, but we have something perdurable to fall back on if moral shock or crisis or change or calamity shall have rudely broken up the whole structure of later associations. Not only the more we mechanize thus the more force of soul is freed for higher work, but we are insured against emergencies in which the choice and deed is likely to follow the nearest motive, or that which acts quickest, rather than

to pause and be influenced by higher and perhaps intrinsically stronger motives. Reflection always brings in a new set of later-acquired motives and considerations, and if these are better than habit-mechanism then pause is good; if not, he who deliberates is lost. Our purposing volitions are very few compared with the long series of desires, acts and reactions, often contradictory, many of which were never conscious, and many once willed but now lapsed to reflexes, the traces of which, crowding the unknown margins of the soul, constitute the organ of the conscious will.

It is only so far as this primitive will is wrong by nature or training, that drastic reconstructions of any sort are needed. Only those who mistake weakness for innocence, or simplicity for candor, or forget that childish faults are no less serious because universal, deny the at least occasional depravity of all children, or fail to see that fear and pain are among the indispensables of education, while a parent, teacher, or even a God, all love, weakens and relaxes the will. Children do not cry for the alphabet, the multiplication table is more like medicine than confectionery, and it is only affected thoroughness that omits all that is hard. "The fruits of learning may be sweet, but its roots are always bitter," and it is this alone that makes it possible to strengthen the will while instructing the mind.

The well-schooled will comes, like Herder, to scorn the luxury of knowing without the labor of learning. We must anticipate the future penalties of sloth as well as of badness. The will especially is a trust we are to administer for the child, not as he may now wish, but as he will wish when more mature. We must now compel what he will later wish to compel himself to do. To find his habits already formed to the same law that his mature will and the world later enjoin, cements the strongest of all bonds between mentor and child. Nothing, however, must be so individual as punishment. For some a threat at rare intervals is enough, while for others, however ominous they may be, they become at once "like scarecrows, on which the foulest birds soonest learn to perch." To scold well and wisely is an art by itself. For some children pardon is the worst punishment; for others, ignoring or neglect; for others, isolation from others, suspension from duties; for others, seclusion—which last, however, is for certain ages beset with extreme danger—and for still others, shame from being made conspicuous. Mr. Spencer's "natural penalties" can be applied to but few kinds of wrong, and those not the worst. Bassedow tied boys who fell into temptation to a strong pillar; if stupid and careless, put on a fool's cap and bells; if they were proud, they were suspended near the ceiling in a basket, as

Aristophanes represented Socrates. Two boys who quarreled, were made to look into each other's eyes before the school till their angry expressions gave way before the general sense of the ridiculous. This is more ingenious than wise. The object of discipline is to avoid punishment, but even flogging should never be forbidden. It may be reserved, like a sword in its scabbard, but should not get so rusted in that it cannot be drawn on occasion. The law might even limit the size and length of the rod and place of application, as in Germany, but it should be of no less liberal dimensions here than there. Punishment should, of course, be minatory and reformatory, and not vindictive, and we should not forget that certainty is more effective than severity, nor that it is apt to make motives sensuous, and delay the psychic restraint which should early preponderate over the physical. But will-culture for boys is rarely as thorough as it should be without more or less flogging. I would not, of course, urge the extremes of the past. The Spartan beating as a gymnastic drill to toughen, the severity which prevailed in Germany for a long time after its Thirty Years' War,* the former fashion in so many English

* Those interested in school statistics may value the record kept by a Swabian schoolmaster named Hauberle, extending over fifty-one years and seven months' experience as a teacher, as follows: 911,527 blows with a cane; 124,010 with

schools of walking up not infrequently to take a flogging as a plucky thing to do, and with no notion of disgrace attaching to it, shows at least an admirable strength of will. Severe constraint gives poise, inwardness, self-control, inhibition, and *noluntas*, if not *voluntas*, while the now too common habit of coquetting for the child's favor, and tickling its ego with praises and prizes, and pedagogic pettifogging for its good will, and sentimental fear of a judicious slap to rouse a spoiled child with no will to break to make it keep step with the rest in conduct, instead of delaying a whole school-room to apply a subtle psychology of motives on it, is bad. This reminds one of the brahmin who sweeps the ground before him lest he should unconsciously tread on a worm. Possibly it may be well, as Schleiermacher suggests, not to repress some one nascent bad act in some natures, but let it and the punishment ensue for the sake of Dr. Spanckster's tonic.

---

a rod; 20,989 with a ruler; 136,715 with the hand; 10,295 over the mouth; 7,905 boxes on the ear; 1,115,800 snaps on the head; 22,763 nota benas with Bible, catechism, hymn-book, and grammar; 777 times boys had to kneel on peas; 613 times on triangular blocks of wood; 5,001 had to carry a timber-mare; and 1,701 hold the rod high, the last two being punishments of his own invention. Of the blows with the cane 800,000 were for Latin vowels, and 76,000 of those with the rod, Bible verses and hymns. He used a scolding vocabulary of over 3,000 terms, of which one-third were of his own invention.

Dermal pain is not the worst thing in the world, and, by a judicious knowledge of how it feels at both ends of the rod, by flogging and being flogged, far deeper pains may be forefended. Insulting defiance, deliberate disobedience, ostentatious carelessness and bravado, are diseases of the will, and, in very rare cases of Promethean obstinacy, the severe process of breaking the will is needful, just as in surgery it is occasionally needful to rebreak a limb wrongly set, or deformed, to set it over better. It is a cruel process, but a crampy will in childhood means moral traumatism of some sort in the adult. Few parents have the nerve to do this, or the insight to see just when it is needed. It is, as some one has said, like knocking a man down to save him from stepping off a precipice. Even the worst punishments are but very faint types of what nature has in store in later life for some forms of perversity of will, and are better than sarcasm, ridicule, or tasks, as penalties. The strength of obstinacy is admirable, and every one ought to have his own will; but a false direction, though almost always the result of faulty previous training, when the soul was more fluid and mobile, is all the more fatal. While so few intelligent parents are able to refrain from the self-indulgence of too much rewarding or giving, though it injures the child, it is perhaps too much to expect the hardihood which can be justly cold to the ca-

resses of a child who seeks, by displaying all its stock of goodness and arts of endearment, to buy back good-will after punishment has been deserved. If we wait too long, and punish in cold blood, a young child may hate us, while, if we punish on the instant, and with passion, a little of which is always salutary, on the principle, *ohne affect kein effect*, an older child may fail of the natural reactions of conscience, which should always be secured. The maxim, *summum jus summa injuria*, we are often told, is peculiarly true in school, and so it is; but to forego all punishment is no less injustice to the average child, for it is to abandon one of the most effective means of will-culture. We never punish but a part, as it were, of the child's nature; he has lied, but is not therefore a liar, and we deal only with the specific act, and must love all the rest of him.

And yet, after all, indiscriminate flogging is so bad, and the average teacher is so inadequate to that hardest and most tactful of all his varied duties, viz., selecting the right out-crop of the right fault of the right child at the right time and place, mood, etc., for best effect, that the bold statement of such principles as above is perhaps not entirely without practical danger, especially in two cases which Madame Necker and Sigismund have pointed out, and several cases of which the present writer has notes. First, an habitually good child sometimes has a saturnalia

of defiance and disobedience; a series of insubordinate acts are suddenly committed which really mark the first sudden epochful and belated birth of the instinct of independence and self-regulation, on which his future manliness will depend. He is quite irresponsible, it is never repeated, and very lenient treatment causes him, after the conflict of tumultuous feelings has expanded his soul, to react healthfully into habitual docility again, if some small field for independent action be at once opened him. The other case is that of *ennui*, of which children suffer such nameless qualms. When I should open half a dozen books, start for a walk, and then turn back, wander about in mind or body, seeking but not finding content in anything, a child in my mood will wish for a toy, an amusement, food, a rare indulgence, only to neglect or even reject it petulantly when granted. These flitting "will-spectres" are physical, are a mild form of the many fatal dangers of fatigue, and punishment is the worst of treatment. Rest or diversion is the only cure, and the teacher's mind must be fruitful of purposes to that end. Perhaps a third case for palliative treatment is, those lies which attend the first sense of badness. The desire to conceal it occasionally accompanies the nascent effort to reform and make the lie true. These cases are probably rare, while the temptation to lie is far greater for one who does ill than for

one who does well, for fear is the chief motive, and a successful lie which concealed would weaken the desire to cure a fault.*

. . . . . .

We have thus far spoken of obedience, and come now to the later necessity of self-guidance, which, if obedience has wrought its perfect work, will be natural and inevitable. It is very hard to combine reason and coercion, yet it is needful that children think themselves free long before we cease to determine them. As we slowly cease to prescribe and begin to inspire, a very few well-chosen mottoes, proverbs, maxims, should be taught very simply, so they will sink deep. Education has been defined as working against the

---

* On the topic of this paragraph there is a voluminous literature in German. The reader may like to consult the following pamphlets and books:

Dr. L. Wiese: Die Bildung des Willens. 4te Auflage, Berlin, 1879.

Th. Weber: Die Lüge des Kindes und ihre Behandlung. Halle, 1881. And Heinroth, Die Lüge.

Ed. Jordan: Die körperliche Züchtigung. Wien, 1881.

A. H. Weinhold: Die hauptsächlichsten Quellen, aus denen die Fehler der Kinder entspringen. In Strümpel's Päd. Abhandlungen, III. Heft. Leipzig, 1877.

K. Pfirsches: Erziehung zur sittlichen Selbständigkeit. Breslau, 1876.

J. Christinger: Die ethische Aufgabe der Schule. Frauenfeld, 1879.

A. W. Grube: Von der sittlichen Bildung der Jugend. Leipzig, 1855.

To these and many others the writer is indebted.

chance influences of life, and it is certain that without some precepts and rules the will will not exert itself. If reasons are given, and energy is much absorbed in understanding, the child will assent but will not do. If the mind is not strong, many wide ideas are very dangerous. Strong wills are not fond of arguments, and if a young person falls to talking or thinking beyond his experience, subjective or objective, both conduct and thought are soon confused by chaotic and incongruous opinions and beliefs, and false expectations, which are the very seducers of the will, arise. There can be little will-training by words, and the understanding cannot realize the ideals of the will. All great things are dangerous, as Plato said, and the truth itself is not only false but actually immoral to unexpanded minds. Will-culture is intensive, not extensive, and the writer knows a case in which even a vacation ramble with a moralizing rabulist has undermined the work of years. Our precepts must be made very familiar, copiously illustrated, well wrought together by habit and attentive thought, and above all clear cut, that the pain of violating them may be sharp and poignant. Vague and too general precepts beyond the horizon of the child's real experience do not haunt him if they are outraged.

Now the child must obey these, and will if he has learned to obey well the commands of others.

One of the best sureties that he will do so is muscle-culture, for if the latter are weaker than the nerves and brain, the gap between knowing and doing appears and the will stagnates. Gutsmuths, the father of gymnastics in Germany before Jahn, used to warn men not to fancy that the few tiny muscles that moved the pen or tongue had power to elevate men. They might titillate the soul with words and ideas, but rigorous, symmetrical muscle-culture alone, he and his Turner societies believed, could regenerate the Fatherland, for it was one thing to paint the conflict of life, and quite another to bear arms in it. They said, "The weaker the body the more it commands; the stronger it is the more it obeys."

In this way we shall have a strong, well-knit soul-texture, made up of volitions and ideas like warp and woof. Mind and will will be so compactly organized that all their forces can be brought to a single point. Each concept or purpose will call up those related to it, and once strongly set toward its object, the soul will find itself borne along by unexpected forces. This power of totalizing, rather than any transcendent relation of elements, constitutes at least the practical unity of the soul, and this unimpeded association of its elements is true or inner freedom of will. Nothing is wanting or lost when the powers of the soul are mobilized for a great

task, and its substance is impervious to passion. With this organization men of really little power accomplish wonders. Without it great minds are confused and lost. They have only velleity or caprice. The will makes a series of vigorous, perhaps almost convulsive, but short inconsistent efforts. As Jean Paul says, there is sulphur, charcoal, and saltpetre in the soul, but powder is not made, for they never find each other. To understand this will-plexus is preëminent among the new demands now laid on educators.

But although this focalizing power of acting with the whole rather than with a part of the soul, gives independence of many external, conventional proximate standards of conduct, deepening our interests in life, and securing us against disappointment by defining our expectations; while such a sound and simple will-philosophy is proof against considerable shock and has firmness of texture enough to bear much responsibility, there is, of course, something deeper, without which all our good conduct is more or less hollow. This is, of course, that better purity established by mothers in the plastic heart, before the superfœtation of precept is possible, or even before the "soul takes flight in language," or perhaps pre-natal or hereditary. Much every way depends on how aboriginal our goodness is, whether the will acts with effort,

as we solve an intricate problem in solitude, or as we say the multiplication table, which only much distraction can confuse, or as we repeat the alphabet, which the din of battle could not hinder. Later and earlier training should harmonize with each other and with nature. Thrice happy he who is so wisely trained that he comes to believe he believes what his soul deeply does believe, to say what he feels and feel what he really does feel, and chiefly whose express volitions square with the profounder drift of his will as the resultant of all he has desired or wished, expected, attended to, or striven for. When such an one comes to his moral majority by standing for the first time upon his own careful conviction, against the popular cry, or against his own material interests or predacious passions, and feels the constraint and joy of pure obligation which comes up from this deep source, a new, original force is brought into the world of wills. Call it inspiration, or Kant's transcendental impulse above and outside of experience, or Spencer's deep reverberations from a vast and mysterious past of compacted ancestral experiences, the most concentrated, distilled and instinctive of all psychic products, and as old as Mr. Tyndall's "fiery cloud,"—the name or even source is little. We would call it the purest, freest, most prevailing, because most inward, will or conscience.

This free, habitual guidance by the highest and best, by conviction with no sense of compulsion or obligation, is an impractical if not dangerous ideal, for it can be actually realized only by the rarest moral genius. For most of us the best education is that which makes us the best and most obedient servants. This is the way of peace and the way of nature, for even if we seriously try to keep up a private conscience at all, apart from feeling, faction, party or class spirit, or even habit, which are our habitual guides, the difficulties are so great that most hasten, more or less consciously and voluntarily, to put themselves under authority again, reserving only the smallest margin of independence in material interests, choice of masters, etc., and yielding to the pleasing and easy illusion that inflates the minimum to seem the maximum of freedom, and uses the noblest ideal of history, viz., that of pure autonomous oughtness, as a pedestal for idols of selfishness, caprice and conceit. The trouble is in interpreting these moral instincts, for even the authorities lack the requisite self-knowledge in which all wisdom culminates. The moral interregnum which the *Aufklaering* has brought will not end till these instincts are rightly interpreted by intelligence. The richest streams of thought must flow about them, the best methods must peep and pry till

their secrets are found and put into the idea-pictures in which most men think.

This brings us, finally, to the highest and also most immediately practical method of moral education, viz., training the will by and for intellectual work. Youth and childhood must not be subordinated as means to maturity. Learning is more useful than knowing. It is the way and not the goal, the work and not the product, the acquiring and not the acquisition, that educates will and character. To teach only results, which are so simple, without methods by which they were obtained, which are so complex and hard, to develop the sense of possession without the strain of activity, to teach great matters too easily or even as play, to always wind along the lines of least resistance into the child's mind, is simply to add another and most enervating luxury to child-life. Only the sense and power of effort, which made Lessing prefer the search to the possession of truth, which trains the will in the intellectual field, which is becoming more and more the field of its activity, counts for character and makes instruction really educating. This makes mental work a series of acts, or living thoughts, and not merely words. Real education, that we can really teach, and that which is really most examinable, is what we do, while those who acquire without effort may be extremely instructed without being truly educated.

It is those who have been trained to put forth mental power that come to the front later, while it is only those whose acquisitions are not transpeciated into power who are in danger of early collapse.

It is because of this imperfect appropriation through lack of volitional reaction that mental training is so often dangerous, especially in its higher grades. Volitional recollection, or forcing the mind to reproduce a train of impressions, strengthens what we may call the mental will; while if multifarious impressions which excite at the time are left to take their chances, at best fragmentary reproduction, incipient amnesia, the prelude of mental decay may be soon detected. Few can endure the long working over of ideas, especially if at all fundamental, which is needful to full maturity of mind, without grave moral danger. New standpoints and ideas require new combinations of the mental elements, with constant risk that during the process, what was already secured will fall back into its lower components. Even our immigrants suffer morally from the change of manners and customs and ideas, and yet education means change; the more training the more change, as a rule, and the more danger during the critical transition period while we oscillate between control by old habits, or association within the old circle of thought, and by the new insights, as a medical

student often suffers from trying to bring the regulation of his physical functions under new and imperfect hygiene insights. Thus most especially if old questions, concerning which we have long since ceased to trust ourselves to give reasons, need to be reopened, there is especial danger that the new equilibrium about which the dynamic is to be re-resolved into static power will be established, if at all, with loss instead of with gain. Indeed, it is a question not of schools but of civilization, whether mental training, from the three R's to science and philosophy, shall really make men better, as the theory of popular education assumes, and whether the genius and talent of the few who can receive and bear it can be brought to the full maturity of knowledge fully facultized—a question paramount, even in a republic, to the general education of the many.

The illusion is that beginnings are hard. They are easy. Almost any mind can advance a little ways into almost any subject. The feeblest youth can push on briskly a little ways into a new subject, but he forgets, and so does the examiner who marks him, that difficulties increase not in arithmetical but in almost geometrical ratio as he advances. A pass mark, say of fifty, should be given not for mastery of the first half of the book, or for a knowledge of half the matter in it, but for that of three-fourths or more.

Suppose he choose the easier method of tattooing his mind by attaining the easy early stages of proficiency in many subjects, as is possible and even encouraged in too many of our school and college curricula, he weakens the will-quality of his mind. Smattering is dissipation of energy. Only great, concentrated and prolonged efforts in one direction really train the mind, because only they train the will beneath it. Many little, heterogeneous efforts of different sorts, as some one has said in substance, leave the mind like a piece of well-used blotting paper, and the will like a rubber band stretched to flaccidity around one after another bundle of objects too large for it to clasp into unity. *In der Beschränkung zeigt sich der meister:* all-sidedness through one-sidedness; by staking the horse or cow out in the spring-time, till he gnaws his small allotted circle of grass to the ground, and not by roving and cropping at will, can he be taught that the sweetest joint is nearest the root, —are convenient symbols of will-culture in the intellectual field. Even a long cram, if only on one subject, which brings out the relations of the parts, or a "one-study college," as is already devised in the West, or the combination of several subjects even in primary-school grades into a "concentration series," as devised by Ziller and Rein, the university purpose as defined by Zeller, of so combining studies that each shall

stand in the course next to that with which it is inherently closest connected by matter and method, or the requirements of one central and two collateral branches for the doctorate examination;—all these devices no doubt tend to give a sense of efficiency, which is one of the deepest and proudest joys of life, in the place of a sense of possession so often attended by the exquisite misery of conscious weakness. The unity of almost any even ideal purpose is better than none, if it tend to check the superficial one of learning to repeat again or of boxing the whole compass of sciences and liberal arts, as so many of our high-schools or colleges attempt.

Finally, in the sphere of mental productivity and originality, a just preponderance of the will-element makes men distrust new insights, quick methods, and short cuts, and trust chiefly to the genius of honest and sustained work, in power of which perhaps lies the greatest intellectual difference between men. When ideas are ripe for promulgation they have been condensed and concentrated, thought traverses them quickly and easily—in a word, they have become practical, and the will that waits over a new idea patiently and silently without anxiety, even though with a deepening sense of responsibility, till all sides have been seen, all authorities consulted, all his latent mental reserves heard from, is the man who "talks with the rifle and not with the water-hose,"

or, in a rough farmer's phrase, "boils his words till he can give his hearers sugar and not sap." Several of the more important discoveries of the present generation, which cost many weary months of toil, have been enumerated in a score or two of lines, so that every experimenter could set up his apparatus and get the results in a few minutes. Let us not forget that in most departments of mental work the more we revise and reconstruct our thought, the longer we inhibit its final expression, the oftener we return to it refreshed from other interests, the clearer and more permeable for other minds it becomes, because the more it tends to express itself in terms of willed action, which is "the language of complete men."

DISCUSSION.

PROFESSOR GREENOUGH, of Rhode Island, said: This subject is so vital in its nature, and the treatment of it by the essayist has been so profound, that the paper should be well studied before any attempt is made to discuss it.

I feel, however, for one, indebted to the lecturer for presenting this, in some sense, new phase of the fundamental philosophy belonging to the teacher's work. We hear, in our conventions, a great deal about the mode of developing the intellect. Objects must be presented at the right time, the native powers called into activity in proper order, and at length the reflective powers receive due culture. But you know, and every teacher knows, that, when an object is

presented, unless the will,—the directive energy of the pupil,—controls his powers, the object is presented in vain. And when we come into the inner recesses of our being, it is not so much what one knows,—what of science he has gathered,—of fact, or principle,—as what are the habitual associations of his inner life. And I could but be impressed with that part of the paper that touched upon this activity of our nature. And I think, as teachers, we have much to learn, in respect to how best to teach our pupils to control the currents of thought so that their associations of ideas, from day to day, shall be in the trend of a useful and pure and efficient life.

We say much about "discipline," which, in its intellectual phase, may be considered as that state in which the powers are under the control of the will. We sometimes,—yes, too often,—forget to add that other element which makes *moral* discipline,—when the will not only controls the powers, but is itself in obedience to law. And I think we shall all approve of what the author has placed before us, when he says that, to accomplish this result, we must present few and fundamental laws, that the child can everywhere, and under every circumstance, apply.

The difficulties in training the will, according to the methods that have been indicated this afternoon, are of a peculiar sort in our own country. We live in a land where independence is applauded, and where, as the lecturer has said this afternoon, we are often disposed to carry the sentiment so far as to applaud obstinacy in the child, and willfulness. We have another difficulty, and that is that there seems to be in the

minds of many,—yes, there *is*,—a real difficulty in bringing to bear upon the will of the child the highest sanctions of moral action. Now I think, in this department, while we are to avoid the shibboleths of sect, we have much to learn as to the methods of building upon the child's intuitions of right, of justice, and of truth. I think if we will but build upon these carefully and wisely, we may lead the child,—though not philosophically, yet practically,—to reason and to apply the law which God has given in the human soul, —so that, if we may not teach the Bible, we may teach from that other revelation, of which the Bible is a counterpart, the law of God in the human soul,—and any sort of setting aside of that, whether it be by setting aside the Bible, or in whatever way it is done,—anything which sets aside the aids which the teacher should have from the law written in the human soul, will be weak in training the will to its highest efficiency.

VIII.

AN ABSTRACT FROM A PAPER ON THE OUTLINES OF A PHILOSOPHY OF DELIVERY.

By Prof. J. W. Churchill, of Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.

THE nature of public address can best be determined by a brief analysis of some specimen of effective oratory and its accompanying results. Burke's great speech at the trial of Warren Hastings was considered, and a part of Macaulay's brilliant description of the memorable scene was read, closing with the famous impeachment. Suppose, now, that a philosophic observer had coolly taken in the whole scene, and had asked himself, what is the radical peculiarity of the magical power that bound that audience in a spell for hours, and sent the listeners away with an impress upon every countenance and every heart? Was it Logic? Grammar? Style? The character of the orator? His voice and action? All these are servants of eloquence. Each might have been used for its own sake. But the speaker had a pur-

pose foreign to these and foreign to himself. He had an *audience* before him. He aimed to move them. He directly addressed them. This, then, is the peculiar power that fused the varied mass of mind into one—the active intention of the speaker to transfer what was in his mind into the minds of his hearers. In a word, it was the determination to communicate *himself*, the most precious thing he had to bestow, and his hearers caught the contagion of his enthusiasm. Argument, arrangement, style, utterance and action were all originated, energized and directed by one vital principle—the intense desire to put his thought and feeling into the minds and hearts of his auditors, so that they should think and feel as he did.

What, now, was the chief instrument out of this organic whole which produced this effect upon the audience? Remember the two inseparable factors in public address—the speaker and the audience. It is evident that the chief thing in public speaking is *speaking*. Before an audience the lightning that melts the mass is delivery. Without the instruments of voice and action the transfer of thought and emotion *cannot* be made. There is no communication. Delivery, then, is determined—thought and emotion externally expressed through voice and gesture. It is the outward expression of the inward impression. It is the real, the interior

man speaking *out*. It is the soul made audible and visible. It is a more accurate symbol of Wordsworth's definition of language — it is thought incarnate. This was what Demosthenes meant by assigning to action the chief place in oratory. Any form of public address is an act in the career of the speaker. His mind is in action; his body is in action; and it is his mind which puts his body into action. Delivery then may be exactly and adequately defined as discourse, modified by the speaker's sincere purpose to influence the minds of his hearers by means of ideas communicated in language and embodied in voice and gesture.

Elocution is not eloquence. It is a mean and not an end. Eloquence is living, persuasive address; but it is the delivery that gains attention, attracts, holds, and transports an assembly. The testimony of the great masters of public address ought to determine the importance of a good delivery and remove objections to the utility of its study.

Citations were made at this point from Demosthenes, Cicero, Aeschines, Massillon, Sargent S. Prentiss, John Quincy Adams, William Wirt, Henry Clay, Patrick Henry, Channing, Rufus Choate, the Rev. Dr. John Hall, Bayard Taylor, Spurgeon, and the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher. With such an array of authority against those who undervalue the importance of a good delivery

and a training to secure it, it is neither candid nor sensible to deny the propriety and the duty of the study.

The vitalized design of the speaker to communicate himself through voice and action may be made the subject of study from three points of view — as a *science*, with its facts and laws; as an *art* used for the purposes of teaching and discipline; as a *critique* for the purpose of applying the principles of the art to any particular sample of delivery for estimating its value. The methodized results of studying the bodily part of eloquence as a subject of educational discipline is Delivery.

The *province* of delivery is, then, definitely circumscribed. It covers all that region of human activity over which the living intention in public address may traverse.

The *end* of delivery is a practical one — the use of voice and action in communicating thought and emotion. The accumulations of experience in public speaking furnish the materials for the development of delivery as a science and as an art. Reflection upon the various ends to which public speech has been applied defines the *departments* of delivery, viz., Persuasion, or Oratory proper, with its practical or ethical end; Recitation, as in dramatic representation, with its artistic or æsthetical end; and Reading, including all forms of delivery from the

manuscript or the printed page, with both its practical and artistic aims.

Delivery as a Science is not an exact science. But the facts of Delivery come within the domain of observation. They can be ascertained, studied, properly related and classified according to their actual connections. When a symmetrical system is honestly matured in this manner, we may presume to speak, in a restricted sense, of a *science* of delivery. As a science it does not say that the facts of delivery *must* be thus and so, but that they *are* thus and so. It is a science as pyschology, music, rhetoric, and æsthetics are sciences. In fine, delivery, in the classification of its phenomena, naturally takes its place as a legitimate department of the science of Æsthetics. In other words the science of delivery is the science of a beautiful manner of public address. Take the three constituents of beauty—Idea, Matter, Form. In closest analogy we discover the same inseparable elements in the first of the æsthetic arts—discourse. The one element of all speech is the *word*. The spoken word is the revelation of thought in sound. The idea, the spiritual element of discourse, is thought. The material is sound, and its frequent accompaniment, gesture. The form is the style of discourse, its unit being the word; and in spoken discourse, the modulations of the voice and significant action. Hence, in the development of the

art of delivery we must proceed according to the principles of æsthetic science.

Under the first law of delivery—that of the idea—we naturally regard the *end* of public address, *i. e.*, the transference of the thought and emotion of the speaker's mind to the hearer's mind. Under the second law—that of the material—we determine the *means* employed in revealing the idea. In the investigation of the nature of the material we are brought into the domain of physical science. It has most intimate relations with anatomy, physiology, and physics. To obtain a scientific basis for a correct method of vocal culture, it is absolutely important to know the voice as a sound-producing body with its wonderful powers and phenomena. Through the aid of the laryngoscope the formation and training of the voice need no longer be a matter of experiment and speculation. Vocal culture may proceed by an intelligent, safe, and scientific method. The result of vocal culture carried on in a skillful and scientific manner is a voice at once powerful, musical, and sympathetic, and that can be produced with ease and endurance. Any correct method of vocal culture must be based upon the physiological conditions of the three essential properties of tone—force, pitch, and quality, or timbre. The accompanying excellences of a beautiful manner of speech as the results of vocal culture, would naturally be

a firm, clear, easy articulation, and a correct pronunciation.

The third law of delivery—the law of form—brings us to a consideration of delivery as an art. Speech shaping itself in modulations of and the voice during the expression of thought emotion in complete discourse now passes under observation.

The *interpreting function* of expressive speech is here most vividly brought into view. The interpreting power in delivery is operative in every sentence the speaker utters. Co-existent with the interpreting power of the speaker is the *receptive power* of the hearer.

The best modern philosophy of written style (Herbert Spencer's) has brought order out of chaos by the enunciation of the great law of mental economy: "The best style is that which best economizes the recipient's attention." One of the most interesting and valuable phases of the science of delivery is the search for the ground of the economy of interpreting power and the application of the law of economy to the expression of speech and gesture in attitude, significant action, articulation, and pronunciation; in the use of the *intellectual instruments* of expression—emphasis, pause, and inflection; and in the use of the *emotional instruments* of expression as manifested in the variations of time, pitch, force, and quality.

We must not fail to notice another application of the law of form in delivery, viz.: The true *method*, or *style*, of public address. The unifying power which fuses the component parts of the organific whole is the speaker's *personality*. "The style is the man," as the French critic truly remarks. The result of infusing the phenomena of speech and of action with the speaker's personality should be a *natural* method of delivery. In a word, the natural method of address in any of its departments is *good conversation ennobled or idealized*. The prevailing law of form in all art is the law of Adaptation — the adaptation of the manner to the matter. The true method of delivery, then, is to obey the law of adaptation of manner to matter in the truthful interpretation of sentiment and the faithful representation of character under the special circumstances of delivery.

Having discussed delivery as a science and an art, under the three laws of æsthetic science, we have a clear path to the consideration of delivery as a *critique* — or delivery in relation to the principles of criticism. These principles can now be applied to the delivery of extemporaneous, memoriter, or written address, and the prime conditions for effective delivery under any one of these modes of delivery can be determined.

Another application of the principles of criticism is to the true method of *teaching* style in

delivery in its two-fold relation to teacher and to pupil. On these points it is not within our province to speak at this time. But attention is called to the application of the first law in delivery — the law of the idea, in order to emphasize what is so often lost sight of in the study and practice of manner and voice in public address, viz.: the Sources of Power in delivery, such as the power of the thought to be delivered as affecting the mental state of the speaker during delivery, the power of emotion, of earnestness, of nerve-force, of self-possession, etc.

In the effective public presentation of ideas to other minds the speaker must address the mind in accordance with the laws of its action. In relation to complete discourse the intellect is occupied in three ways — as reason, imagination, and memory. The feelings are manifested in the production of emotions and in the modification of emotions. Thought and emotion in relation to delivery are to be regarded as a two-fold state of one mental activity. The natural rhetorical use of these mental states is to treat them as laws of action and sources of power in delivery, and not as scientific terms in mental philosophy. In this psychological aspect of our topic we find the hiding of the speaker's power — the fountain-heads of his inspiration. The fundamental principle of the art of delivery is, that direct address to an audience primarily consists in the expression of the

dominant states of the speaker's mind, and that to communicate these dominant states to the audience is the chief business of the speaker in the act of delivery. The leading states of mind determine the modulations of the voice and the character of oratorical action. Thought, as the substance to be transferred from the speaker's mind and impressed upon the minds of his auditors, is a source of power. Vigorous thought on noble themes inspires a speaker with energy. It gives concentrated power to delivery. It is difficult to give forcible and vivid effect to weak and barren productions. The speaker gets no momentum from a feeble theme. Good speaking and good reading and recitation are largely dependent on good thinking. To secure the highest power in delivery the subject-matter, the idea of the discourse, must be made as thought*ful* as it is possible for laborious thinking to make it. Then the speaker can speak with the power and accent of conviction.

Feeling is even more a source of power in delivery than thought. The emotions and passions of the soul are the inspirational sources of eloquence.

"Woulds't make me weep? Then thou thyself must grieve."

As emphasis, pause, and inflection are the intellectual instruments in delivery, so quality, pitch, stress, and movement are the emotional

instruments. In other words, modulation is the effect of feeling in utterance. Oratorical and dramatic *action*, too, have their source in the emotional, rather than in the intellectual part of our nature. It is the emotion of anger and not its definition that leads a man to contract the brow, clench the hand, and stamp the foot. The public speaker should symbolize his emotional rather than his intellectual states. No art of the teacher can impart the feeling which inspires the mystical language of the passions, but the study of the signs and symbols of excited feeling is both legitimate and useful. The result of patient study under skillful guidance, is available and polished power.

Assuming the possession of thought and feeling as original inspiring power, and adding the power over voice and action as the instruments and media of thought and feeling, it is evident that the chief business of the speaker when actually confronting an audience is an affair of the soul. Here we touch upon the *moral* part of delivery. Training having done its best, the *character* of the speaker — his sincerity, sympathy, and uprightness come to the front. Fire must kindle fire. The truly effective speaker is the good man excited, with the power of communicating his excitement. As Emerson puts it, "the essential thing in speaking is heat, and heat

comes of sincerity." The chief ends of oratory are directly or indirectly *moral.*

A speaker who is in downright earnest cannot be a dull speaker. His mode of speaking is business-like. People see that he has an enthusiasm for truth; that he speaks from his heart. They like to hear him, for he speaks as if he means every word he says. Many speakers do not dare to speak as well as they can for fear of being accused of over-doing their speaking. They often repress earnest and honest feeling. They forget that it is the speaker's *duty* to express, not to repress. It is his *business* to communicate with power. Some speakers consciously cultivate a repressed style of delivery, and fondly think that it is "classical." As disciples of "culture" they aim to be calm and correct, and often succeed in realizing the description of the face of Tennyson's Maud:

> "Her cold and clear-cut face,
> Faultily faultless, icily regular, splendidly null."

But it must not be forgotten that there is an energy that is born out of the mastery of strong feeling. A concentrated delivery is often the expression of a soul full of intense feeling, but held under restraint. The speaking of Daniel Webster and of Frederick William Robertson often illustrated the impressive influence of reserved power. There is always an inward fire

in such speaking, but the speaker retains his self-possession while allowing himself to be carried away.

Sympathy, as well as sincerity, must be present in the character of the speaker. His speaking must be permeated with the genial warmth and glow of a generous, unselfish heart, bent upon seeking the broad and common interests of philanthropy. That was a true saying of a wise French preacher—"To address men well they must be loved much." But sincerity and sympathy do more than affect and enhance the speaker's delivery; they are the *conditions of influence* over the audience. Men will not surrender themselves to a speaker whom they believe to be deceiving and misleading them. The orator's character gives character to his words. His words must throb with his sincere, honest, benevolent life. His rhetorical life then becomes identified with his daily life and is natural to him. At this point we are reminded of the wise Goethe's ringing words of contempt for artifice in public address:

"If feeling does not prompt, in vain you strive;
If from the soul the language does not come
By its own impulse to impel the hearts
Of hearers with communicated power,
In vain you strive, in vain you study earnestly.
Startle the school-boys with your metaphors;
And, if such food may suit your appetite,
Win the vain wonder of applauding children;

But never hope to stir the hearts of men,
And mould the souls of many into one,
By words which come not native from the heart."

From this survey, I trust that I have been able, not only to demonstrate the dignity of the subject, but that I have also been successful in disclosing my aim in presenting it, viz.: To place the often-slighted art of Delivery on a firm basis of scientific principles; to show that the art strikes its roots far into the deepest and richest soil of the man himself; that it is most intricately woven into the sciences of psychology, physiology, physics, and especially of æsthetics, of which it is a legitimate department; that we want power, life, and naturalness in delivery, and that the aim of elocutionary culture is to give polished and well-directed power. Power must have guidance, and art gives that guidance. I do not claim for my art that high rank which has been ascribed to it by some of its enthusiastic professors, as one of the Fine Arts, but I do claim that it is *a* fine art; and it is all the finer because of its humble but important function of helping us to use all other gifts and graces of mind and of character.

IX.

WHAT PLACE, IF ANY, IS RELIGION ENTITLED TO, IN OUR SYSTEM OF PUBLIC EDUCATION?

By Rev. A. J. F. Behrends, D. D., Providence, R. I.

MR. HERBERT SPENCER introduces his discussion of the origin and authority of our ethical judgments by the remark that there can be "no correct idea of a part without a correct idea of the correlative whole." The particular can be understood only through its relation to the universal. He who has never seen a wagon can form no adequate idea of the use or action of a wheel. And the knowledge of the whole necessary to a proper knowledge of a part is two-fold, quantitative and qualitative; "there must be some conception of the whole in its distribution as well as in its amount"; that is to say, the knowledge of the whole must be such as to give to the part both a place and the right place.

Innocent, and perhaps unmeaning, as this prin-

ciple may seem to be, it touches one of the earliest and most hotly debated problems of philosophy, the relation of the one to the many, of universals to particulars; and its practical significance is of the very highest order. By Mr. Spencer it is applied to human conduct, which he insists must be studied as a living organism, whose unity should never be lost sight of in the almost endless diversity of parts. "Conduct is a whole,"—that is the preliminary affirmation. The principle applies with equal force to education, whose living unity must not be overlooked, and where no theory can be accepted as complete in which that unity is not preserved and promoted. Education is a whole, involving the whole man, and covering the entire period of his existence; and therefore any educational policy that ignores or neglects any one of man's endowments, or any part of his existence, is vicious and demoralizing. A part can retain its integrity only through the jealous preservation of its relation to the whole. Sever the branch from the vine, and it can only wither.

Now the subject of education is gifted with manifold capacities and powers, physical, mental, moral; and by the general consent of mankind he is the heir of immortality. He sustains relations to nature, to the brute creation, to the family, to the state, to universal humanity, and, as most men believe, to eternity and to the living

God—in whom eternity finds its home. The education of such a being is a matter of the highest importance, involving not only the curriculum of the school, but the larger discipline of life. The school is only a section, and a very small section too, of the great inclusive educational polity. It has its definite work, and is not called, or fitted, to interfere with or to discharge what belongs to other departments. It cannot, and should not, invade the province of home, or of mechanical industry, or of political life, or of the church. Its educational functions are limited and defined, and it should be kept clear from domestic, industrial, political, and ecclesiastical complications. It is no more called to make good parents, or good mechanics, or good citizens, than good church-members and bishops. But the definiteness of its vocation must not be pressed to isolation; much less to hostility; the part must not be severed from the whole, and the spirit of the living whole must pervade the minutest part. Hence the training of the school should fit into the methods and results of all life's educational departments. Your primary school does not teach geometry and Latin, but all it does teach is in harmony with the entire curriculum. The multiplication table does not clash with Euclid, and there is no conflict between the primer and Cæsar's commentaries. Now if the school is only a section of universal education,

preparatory thereto and continued therein, care must be taken to preserve the relation to the larger unity. Nothing has a right in the school-room that is hostile to the great forces by which life and history are moulded. The full pulse of man's broad life must be reproduced in the habitual tone and temper of the school-room. The sanctities of home must be respected. The dignity and the obligation of productive labor must be recognized. The elements of morality must be scrupulously revered. And until you can show that the convictions of the Divine existence and moral authority, and of man's rational, responsible constitution and personal immortality, whose impress is on all literature, ancient and modern, fibred on all historic achievement, crystallized in the pyramids of Egypt and the great cathedrals of Europe, voiced in all the philosophers from Socrates to Hegel, and in all the great poets from Homer to Milton, are the creations of a disordered fancy, religion must not find the graduates of the school its indifferent hearers or its pronounced enemies.

The main position I take then, is that while religious teaching is not the business of the public school, the school is false to life, and thereby false to itself, if it is pervaded by the spirit of indifference or of hostility to religion. Implicitly, in tone, temper, and trend, though not explicitly, by the introduction of text-books and

formal instruction, our public schools should be definitely and positively religious and christian. And this thesis I am prepared to defend on historical, on patriotic, and on moral grounds.

1. I plead for the recognition and respectful treatment of religion, and especially of Christianity, on purely historical grounds. The temper of scientific instruction demands this. The instinct to worship is peculiar to man, and universal. Some notions of a Supreme being and of a future life are found among the rudest races, and if there be any tribes where they do not exist, they are so insignificant and so little known as not to constitute any appreciable exception, while these religious judgments increase in power as civilization advances. The earliest architecture was associated with the temple and the tomb. The literature of all nations is of religious origin. Philosophy finds its deepest problems in our ethical judgments and religious aspirations, in the imperatives of the moral law and the implications therein involved. The highest poetry has been of religious inspiration and has dealt with sacred themes. Music, painting, and sculpture have gathered their greenest laurels in the fields of religion. Ignore religion, as unworthy of attention, and the door is barred against the study of the ancient classics, and of all that is greatest in the literatures of France, Germany, and England. There can be no se-

rious, earnest teaching of history, where the religious element is ignored or treated with scorn; for the ideas that constitute religion have been the mightiest of historic forces, and if these are fanciful and unsubstantial, history is the idlest of all studies. Religion, then, is entitled to respectful treatment, on purely scientific and historical grounds, as having always powerfully influenced human conduct and human achievement; and of all forms of religion, Christianity is clearly entitled to supreme and peculiar reverence, in view of what it is, what it has done, and the loving devotion with which millions of intelligent and good men and women regard it. When you consider the massive simplicity of the Mosaic Decalogue, and its influence on the moral life of nearly thirty-five hundred years, when you weigh the matchless utterances of the Sermon on the Mount, in which the ancient law only received its full interpretation, and when you measure the unapproached and exceptional moral elevation of the youthful prophet of Nazareth, of whom Renan declares that to tear His name from this world "would be to rend it to its foundations," the affectation of indifference to religion is an impertinence, and the avowal of hostility a literary crime. I do not speak as a preacher, not even as a christian disciple; I urge my plea simply on the ground of scientific impartiality. You might as well ignore the law

of gravity in an explanation of the planetary system, as to ignore the power of religion in human history, or the sovereignty of christian ideas in modern civilization. Even Gibbon, with all his wealth of learning, and genius for graceful composition, could not write a history of Rome's decline and fall, without giving a conspicuous place to the leading articles of the christian faith. Much less can there be any intelligent or earnest study of the history of the Middle Ages, of the stirring Reformation period, and of the wonderful movements of the last three hundred years, if Christianity be ignored or treated as a baseless superstition. You would feel indignant and outraged if a teacher should use his school-room to make political partisans, or to attack and ridicule republican institutions; but in a comparison with Christianity, or the sanctities of universal religion, democracy is sectional and a modern innovation. Historical impartiality is violated when a teacher, to whom facts should be sacred in proportion to their antiquity, universality, and persistence, assumes the rôle of a religious skeptic. If he be an atheist, or a pantheist, or a materialist, or an agnostic, let him at least preserve a decent silence in the school-room; for here the broad historic truth, not the idiosyncrasy of personal judgment, should be enthroned.

2. I urge my plea for the implicit recognition

of religion, and the respectful treatment of Christianity, on patriotic as well as on historical grounds. We are living in a period of most momentous changes. Silently and peacefully, but more swiftly than any of us imagine, the face of the earth is undergoing the most wonderful of revolutions. The steamship, the telegraph, the printing-press, bear their part in the mighty regenerations. But of all these forces immigration is by far the subtlest and most pervasive. Europe is once more in motion. Fifteen hundred years ago the barbarians had crushed and supplanted the august empire of Rome, the mightiest monument of heathen political organization, and that invasion introduced the modern political life of Europe. Ships are doing now what the sword did then. Immigration has taken the place of invasion. When you read that over twenty-five thousand emigrants landed at Castle Garden alone in a single week, adding a million and a half to our population annually, it is impossible to exaggerate or even to measure the influence of this peaceful invasion. How shall we preserve our American nationality against the European and the Asiatic pressure? Legislation will be found to be as vain as was Dame Partington's attempt to beat back with her legendary broom the tides of the Atlantic. There are some things that even an American Congress cannot control. And yet it would be an unspeakable calamity, as it seems

to me, if our distinct and distinctive American nationality should perish under these migrating tides. Never in all our history was there such a call for intelligent and persistent patriotism as there is to-day. And what is patriotism? Is it making a noise on the Fourth of July? Is it boasting of our territory, our material resources, our increasing population, our ability to defy, insult, and whip every other nation on the face of the earth? The braggart or the bully is not the ideal man, and when a nation spends its breath in boasting and bullying, thoughtful and true men are silenced and shamed. Genuine patriotism is intent on preserving and increasing the moral forces in the life of the nation, and on retaining for those forces the forms they assumed when the nation was born. There is a moral continuity in national life, as there is a vital continuity in physical life; and in guarding that moral continuity patriotism discharges its highest office.

There is nothing more wonderful in nature than the persistence of its types. What things are in embryo and at birth, they are sure to be at maturity. A thousand years leaves the oak an oak. History proclaims no less clearly the persistence of national types. What nations are at the time of their birth, they are likely to be centuries afterwards in all the essential features of their national life. You can easily enlarge

the boundaries, change the commercial and political centres, but it is not so easy or innocent to change the primitive and organizing type. Ideas, not numbers, rule the world; and the ideas that give birth to commonwealths, and shape their institutions, are neither common, nor crude, nor profane, nor evanescent. They are choice, sacred, immortal, sown by a Divine hand in a soil providentially prepared.

The American people had a remarkable origin in the thirty thousand Puritan fugitives, of whom the little crew of the "Mayflower" was a fair sample; and Plymouth Rock is not only the beginning, but the prophetic type, of American history. I recall no historical parallel so wonderful, except that of Israel's exodus from the land of bondage under the leadership of Moses. Both seemed destined to be swallowed up in the wilderness, and annihilated by the hostile tribes. Both survived the wilderness of their discipline under the guidance of a fiery and cloudy pillar, and both became the marvel of witnessing generations. It may truthfully be said that no nation ever had such a birth as our own. For the ancestral traditions of all other nations are associated with times and customs that suggest ignorance, barbarism, and heathenism; our own are radiant with high intelligence, domestic sanctity, christian virtue, from the very beginning. Protestant Christianity is fibred upon the inmost life

of our national origin; these broad acres were consecrated by prayer before they were planted with corn; the fort was a church, and the musket was within easy reach of the devout worshiper; the school and the meeting-house stood side by side; the primer and the Bible walked hand in hand. These facts in our early history mean something. Again and again, when some grave critical hour has come, as when the integrity of our national existence was seriously threatened, or when the awful gloom of last summer rested on the land, the old Pilgrim spirit and faith had a mighty resurrection, and in spite of sneers we cried unto the God of our fathers, the God of the battle and of the storm. American patriotism must be true to Plymouth Rock, true to the Protestant Christianity of which American history was born.

And this is my answer to those who claim either that all religion should be ignored in our public schools, or that equal recognition should be given to atheism, pantheism, Mohammedanism, heathenism, Roman and Protestant Christianity; the nation is distinctively Christian and Protestant in its origin and organizing life; and it has an unquestionable right to preserve its national type. It cannot be summoned to commit suicide, or to divide the inheritance God has given it among discordant or hostile claimants. We welcome all men to our shores. But we in-

sist that the fundamental law of the land shall not be changed, that our institutions shall remain intact, that all immigrants shall become Americans in spirit, if not in speech. But back of democracy, in the secret structure of our national life, lies the religious spirit of the Pilgrims; beneath the Constitution, as the eternal rock on which it reposes, is the Bible. Christianity, therefore, and Protestant Christianity, has a peculiar claim to recognition in all our public institutions, on the ground of highest patriotism, loyalty to those great seed-thoughts of which our present institutions are only the outgrowth and fruitage. If our boys and girls are to have an intelligent and hearty love for their country, a commendable pride in the character and sacrifices of the nation's founders, I do not see how this can be done apart from an implicit recognition, at least, of Protestant Christianity as the formative and controlling law of our national life.

3. I have argued for the implicit recognition and the respectful treatment of religion in general, and of Christianity in particular, on historical and patriotic grounds. The school may not ignore or despise what enters so largely into universal history, and what has so powerfully shaped and impressed American institutions. I press the same plea on ethical considerations, on the ground that without the implicit sanctions of re-

ligion, morality loses its authority and power. This brings us to the crucial point of the conflict. The common sense of the people would not tolerate a system of public education for twenty-four hours, in which moral obligation should be discarded as an obsolete notion, in which vice and virtue should be treated with equal favor, in which truth and falsehood, honesty and fraud, kindness and cruelty should be regarded with equal indifference. There is sufficient unanimity and emphasis in our primary ethical judgments to constitute them an unwritten law before which the national educational polity must bow. Our boys and girls, our young men and maidens, must not only have physical training, and mental discipline and furnishing; we insist that it is of infinitely more importance that their moral character shall be confirmed and strengthened by the educational discipline. We do not insist on the introduction of ethical text-books,— many of us regard such an attempt with suspicion and distrust; but we do demand that the whole atmosphere of the school-room, and the tone of its work, shall be such as to be helpful in the formation of good character. Now the proposition which it seems to me is impregnable, is that the most elementary morality loses its authority and power when it is divorced from the fundamental verities of religion.

I should not be surprised if more than once you have started the inquiry, what in this discus-

sion is understood by religion, and how is Christianity regarded as modifying it? We are sometimes told that it will be early enough to provide a place for religion in our public schools, when the advocates of religion shall agree on what religion is. The smartness of the reply can hardly conceal its shallowness. For the criticism confounds religion and theology, and there is no need in an assembly of American teachers to argue against theological indoctrination in our public schools. But religion is as simple a matter as theology is complicated. There are only three fundamental verities in religion, and the etymology of the word suggests them. *Religo* means to bind back, and in this definition three things are involved: The thing that is bound, *man;* the bond itself, *the moral law;* and that to which the thing bound is attached, *the Living God.* The infinite excellence and moral supremacy of God, the personal freedom and moral responsibility of man, are the two great verities on which religion reposes, and the living tie by which God and man are united constitutes the spring and the spirit of the moral law. That law is summed up in loving obedience to God. Christianity modifies this general result by making Jesus Christ the authoritative representative and exponent, both of the Divine character and of man's constitution; and for the interpretation of the mind of Jesus Christ, the Church of Rome points

to the living priesthood, with an infallible Pope at its head, while Protestantism appeals to the Scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments. The religion of Protestant Christianity, therefore, is fully recognized when these three things are maintained,—that God is a Being of infinite excellence and the rightful moral governor of the universe, that man is by constitution a free and responsible moral agent, and that in the Bible there is a clear and adequate revelation both of the character and will of God, and of the duty of man. These three fundamental verities of Christianity are entitled to implicit and habitual recognition in every department of our educational polity, as indispensable to the maintenance of a firm and healthy morality. Any other foundation is the merest sand.

This part of the subject is too large for minute and exhaustive discussion at the present time. The argument might proceed affirmatively and analytically, by discussing the nature of moral obligation, and tracing our ethical judgments to their primary elements and original sources; or it might be conducted practically and historically, by showing that morality has been purest and most vigorous, where the essential verities of religion have been invested with living power; or it might be framed negatively and apologetically, by calling attention to the conspicuous failure of the most elaborate endeavor of modern times to

provide for morality a basis in which religion should be wholly ignored. It is only to this form of the argument that I shall, in closing, more particularly revert, glancing only very briefly at the analytical and positive proofs.

Morality always implies the presence of two clearly recognized facts, the ethical freedom and responsibility of the agent, and his rational subordination to a universal moral ideal. As the harmony of planetary motion is the result of an incessant blending of the centrifugal and the centripetal forces, so is morality the living agreement of free choice with absolute law. The absence of either would make righteousness impossible. Deny the freedom of the will, make man the creature of circumstance, the physical impersonation of forces slumbering in the primeval fire-mist, shaping themselves into his present convictions and purposes by successive cycles of differentiation and integration, or make character the necessary result of an eternal Divine decree, and moral life becomes a myth. Character has no existence or meaning in the philosophy either of physical or of spiritual determinism. And against the granite ledge of the universal moral consciousness every species of the deterministic philosophy hopelessly dashes and breaks to pieces. Be its prophet Spinoza, or Calvin, or Herbert Spencer, every man knows with the clearness of intuition that while there is a range

of life where his volition plays only a very small and subordinate part, if any,—there is also a sphere where his will is the determining agency, and it is only within this sphere that moral approval and disapproval appear. Morality, then, is coterminous with the realm of personal freedom, and where that freedom is ignored, explicitly or implicitly, morality cannot be encouraged or enforced. But the recognition of an absolute and universal moral law, of an ultimate moral ideal, is as necessary to morality as the recognition of free agency. For twenty-five hundred years the attempt has been made to show that duty and prudence are convertible terms, that principle and policy are two names for the same thing, that there is no fixed, eternal standard of moral obligation, but only a variable one of prudential adjustment to our physical conditions; but the prophets have spoken with no authority to the moral convictions of the race. Spite of all the labored and learned metaphysical ingenuity, we find ourselves affirming that while the right must always and in the end be the wise, the prudent, and the beneficent, there is something more and higher than all these in the *right*. The word "*ought*" is the last word in the vocabulary of reason. It is the categorical imperative that brooks neither limitation nor substitution. It deals only with the eternal and the universal, that which is underived and unlimited. Only that

commands me with unqualified authority in which the duty enjoined is recognized as intrinsically and universally obligatory. It must be sovereign in heaven as well as on earth. An empirical or secular morality is a contradiction in terms; for what is based on empirical grounds can only be prudent or imprudent, while righteousness must find within itself the reason of its universal and eternal justification. It has been well said that he who obeys conscience for the sake of an easy conscience does not obey conscience at all. But where shall we look for this universal and eternal ideal toward which the human conscience is turned, as the eye is turned to the light, and apart from whose sanctions morality languishes and dies? You may call it the moral order of the universe, the secret, pervasive force that makes for righteousness; but you must locate as well as name it; you must give it being, the very highest and most energetic being, as well as honor it in your speech. This moral ideal is the most majestic of all facts in the universe of thought. Dominating all intelligences, armed with the subtlest energy where the moral consciousness is keenest and most intense, it cannot be itself impersonal, unrational, unconscious. The neuter gender cannot represent this force; no term is its full equivalent except the word *God*. And where that word is ignored,

morality droops and dies as inevitably as where the gospel of fatalism is preached. I pass now to the apologetic or negative argument substantiating the same conclusion.

Mr. Herbert Spencer is the acknowledged head of the school whose watchword in the sphere of ethics is "the secularization of morals." His *Data of Ethics* is his latest authoritative utterance, and may be regarded as the Secularist Bible. The book is confessedly premature in its appearance. But Mr. Spencer declares that he was moved by two reasons to hasten its preparation and publication: first, his own increasing infirmities, admonishing him that he might not be able to complete his original plan; secondly, and mainly, because as moral injunctions were losing the authority given by their supposed sacred origin, it was absolutely necessary that the rules of right conduct should be established on a scientific basis. We may assume that under so philanthropic a pressure Mr. Spencer has done the best to fill the gap, and with such a preliminary announcement no one will read the book without eager and sustained attention. But the disappointment is bitter and unqualified. Through successive chapters on the physical, the biological, the psychological, and the sociological view of moral conduct, on egoism and altruism, on absolute and relative ethics, the conclusion of an

argument conducted through nearly three hundred pages shapes itself in these words: "A code of perfect personal conduct can never be made definite. Many forms of life, diverging from one another in considerable degrees, may be so carried on in society as entirely to fulfill the conditions to harmonious coöperation. And if various types of men, adapted to various types of activities, may thus lead lives that are severally complete after their kinds, no specific statement of the activities universally required for personal well-being is possible." Still he ventures on a summary of certain general requirements that must be fulfilled "by the individuals of all societies." Here, then, we come to the Spencerian code, proposed as the scientific substitute for the obsolete Mosaic Decalogue. It contains four statutes: "An average balance between waste and nutrition has universally to be preserved. Normal vitality implies a relation between activity and rest falling within moderate limits of variation. Continuance of the society depends on satisfaction of those primarily personal needs which result in marriage and parenthood. Perfection of individual life hence implies certain modes of action which are approximately alike in all cases, and which therefore become part of the subject-matter of ethics." But, as if alarmed at his audacity, he immediately adds: "That it is possible to reduce even this restricted part to

scientific definiteness, can scarcely be said.—That it will ever be practicable to lay down precise rules for private conduct, may be doubted."

It was not my original intention to do anything more than to present this brief summary of Mr. Spencer's argument, in which the self-confessed failure of his elaborate ethical reconstruction appears; but on review the paragraph trenches so closely on what may appear as caricature, that I venture to tax your patience by entering on a closer, though still very brief, analysis. Conduct is defined as an adjustment of means to ends. There is no conduct that is right or wrong in itself; it is right only in so far as, and because, it is pleasurable and beneficial; it is wrong only in so far as, and because, it is painful and detrimental. Every faculty has the right of full and free expression. Only when its exercise produces pain is it wrongfully used; this is the physical limitation and law of morality. Man, however, is an organism, constituted of many and varied energies, each of which is entitled to equal manifestation and exercise, and hence there is wrong not only in undue intensity of any particular activity, but in disproportionateness of activity, in which the coördinate rights of other faculties are trenched upon or ignored; this is the biological limitation and law of morality. Again, the quality of pleasure, as higher and lower, must not be overlooked, while the longest period

through which pleasure may be promoted and secured has also a right to recognition; and this is the psychological limitation and law of morality.

This reduces the problem to two main points, the morality of egoism, and the morality of altruism. The ethical code of egoism is "Live for yourself"; the code of altruism is "Live for others"; and in the conciliation of these imperatives lies the main problem of ethics. To the solution of this problem Mr. Spencer devotes four of his most incisive chapters; and the conclusion is that the imperatives of egoism are primary and basic, while those of altruism are secondary and subordinate. An "egoistic altruism" is the substance of the Spencerian ethics. Ultimately, whatever is pleasurable and beneficial to me, is right; and I am under obligation to take into account the gain or loss to humanity by my action only in so far as, and because, it necessarily reacts on my own pleasure or pain. Or, to put the matter concretely, though not in Mr. Spencer's language, if falsehood and fraud lead to detection, and so to personal injury, or if they involve others in shame and ruin, lying and stealing are wrong; but if by either lying or stealing I can benefit myself without greatly injuring others, or benefit others without injury to myself, the action is morally permissible.

It is plain that in such a system there can be no absolute and universal ethical requirements.

Not only are the Ten Commandments abolished, but any substitution for them is impertinent and impossible. Mr. Spencer is only true to his philosophy when he declares that Absolute Ethics must always remain unknown and unknowable. For as our present ethical judgments are the accumulated and consolidated accretions of experience running up through all forms of sentient life, from the mollusk to man, and as this evolutionary process never comes to an end, the ethics of the future may be no more like the ethics of the present than the ethics of the present are like the ethics of the mollusk. The ideal man can be neither known nor described until the ideal society appears; and hence we must be content with relative ethics, with a right that is "the least wrong," while in many cases we cannot even ascertain with precision which is the least wrong.

Thus even in the field of relative ethics, there are many questions to which only approximately true answers can be given. And this necessarily follows from making egoism the basic law of morality. One man's excess is another's moderation; and if self-expression be the basic right, then so long as men are differently constituted and circumstanced, there can be no definite rules by which they can be regarded as necessarily and universally bound. Morality degenerates into prudence, determined by physical, biological,

psychological, and sociological considerations; and in the final resort every man must be his own judge. Thus does this philosophy eliminate the living God, reduce the claims of humanity to a vanishing point, and leave us only a morality of prudential self-indulgence.

Mr. Spencer's book is certainly a psychological curiosity, whatever may be said of its philosophy. Its author discerned clearly enough the elements and the magnitude of the problem, and he must have known what he intended to write; but at the end the promised solution and reconstruction are not only not forthcoming, but we are repeatedly assured that they are probably forever beyond our reach. We have lost the guidance of a regulative system whose authority was due to its supposed sacred origin, and in its place there is an eternal and hopeless vacancy. Such a collapse is the most impressive of all proofs that morality must rely on the Divine authority and sanctions for its basis and support.

It is an old saying that a house divided against itself cannot stand; and it is instructive to note that the new ethical philosophy does not commend itself to so representative a scientist as Mr. Thomas Henry Huxley, who certainly is Mr. Spencer's superior as a man of practical affairs, however inferior to him in speculative ability, and who will not be suspected of any undue favoritism for Christianity. Addressing himself,

some years since, to the work that the London School Board should attempt to do, he made prominent the department of moral education; and in the course of the discussion he squarely and emphatically pronounced against the theories and methods of the secularists. "My belief is," he says, "that no human being, and no society composed of human beings, ever did, or ever will come to much, unless their conduct was governed and guided by the love of some ethical ideal. And if I were compelled to choose for one of my own children, between a school in which real religious instruction is given, and one without it, I should prefer the former, even though the child might have to take a good deal of theology with it. I have always been strongly in favor of secular education, in the sense of education without theology; but I must confess I have been no less seriously perplexed to know by what practical measures the religious feeling, which is the essential basis of conduct, was to be kept up, in the present utterly chaotic state of opinion on these matters, without the use of the Bible. The pagan moralists lack life and color, and even the noble stoic, Marcus Antoninus, is too high and refined for an ordinary child. Take the Bible as a whole; make the severest deductions which fair criticism can dictate for shortcomings and positive errors; eliminate as a sensible lay-teacher would do, if left to himself,

all that is not desirable for children to occupy themselves with; and there still remains in this old literature a vast residuum of moral beauty and grandeur. And then consider the great historical fact that, for three centuries, this book has been woven into the life of all that is best and noblest in English history; that it has become the national epic of Britain, and is as familiar to noble and simple, from John-o'-Groat's house to Land's End, as Dante and Tasso once were to the Italians; that it is written in the noblest and purest English, and abounds in exquisite beauties of mere literary form; and, finally, that it forbids the veriest hind who never left his village to be ignorant of the existence of other countries and other civilizations, and of a great past, stretching back to the furthest limits of the oldest nations in the world. By the study of what other book could children be so much humanized and made to feel that each figure in that vast historical procession fills, like themselves, but a momentary space in the interval between two extremities; and earns the blessings or the curses of all time, according to its effort to do good and hate evil, even as they also are earning their payment for their work?"

Education must be true to life, and to every department of life. It may not shape its work by theories that have never been tested, whose interpretation confuses the ordinary understand-

ing, whose postulates call in question and deny the universal deliverances of our moral nature. It must be conservative in the best sense, adhering to what has historically proved itself to be healthy and helpful. If the heavens arch above and circle the earth, it is worse than idle to ignore them. Pervasive and powerful as the sunlight have been the convictions of the Divine existence, of man's moral freedom and immortal destiny. And in interpreting these fundamental verities of religion, Christianity has spoken with living authority, presenting the highest of moral ideals, and enforcing the same by the most impressive sanctions. Thus far no worthy competitor for the chair of morals has appeared. Confucius, Sakya-Mouni, Mahomet, Socrates, Seneca, are left far in the rear; the morality of the civilizations and races of which they were representatives and leaders will not bear a moment's comparison with the ethical life produced and promoted by the prophets of the Old and New Testaments. Perhaps Moses and Christ may be superseded; perhaps the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount may be outgrown and improved; but as yet the new prophet has not spoken, the new gospel of ethics has not been proclaimed, and the old wine is still the best.

I have defined religion as primarily affirming the two great related verities of God's infinite ex-

cellence and supreme moral authority, and of man's free moral agency and personal responsibility, while Protestant Christianity adds to this summary the Bible as containing an adequate interpretation, both of the character of God and the duty of man. As thus summarized I have entered a plea for the implicit and habitual recognition of the religion of Christianity in our system of public education, and I have based my plea on historical, patriotic, and moral grounds. Many argue for more than the implicit recognition of religion in general, and of Christianity in particular; I am content to rest in the claim that God, the soul, and the Bible, are entitled to devout recognition and habitual respect in our public schools; and for one, I most earnestly hope that in all these schools the Bible will never cease to be read, the Lord's Prayer never cease to be repeated, and that the precepts of morality will always be enforced on the ground of their Divine authority and sanction.

REPORT

OF THE

NECROLOGY COMMITTEE

OF THE

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION,

FOR 1882.

WHILE an association, whose membership is as large as ours, cannot, in any year, reasonably expect to escape the assaults of death, the year just closed has witnessed the departure from earthly scenes, of an unusual number of those whose names have been enrolled on our records, and who have, at times, met with us at our annual gatherings. Of the large number who assembled at our fiftieth anniversary how few will survive to take part in celebrating our centennial! But while men die, the consequences of their deeds and their influence continue. Of all who took active part in the organization of this Institute, only one survives, and that is our honored friend, Gen. H. K. Oliver, now of Boston. A year ago he was with us at St. Albans, and many of us listened, with pleasure, to words of wisdom from his lips. He still lives, laden with years and honors. The fathers die, but the children live and show forth the spirit and influence of the fathers,— and so the founders of institutions and associations depart from earth, but others assume the care of the work instituted by them and carry it toward completion. Though the great and good men who brought into existence this Association have, with a single exception, gone to their reward, the work of their organizing goes on,— a monument to their wisdom and foresight.

Since our last annual meeting thirteen, whose names are on our roll, have been called to the spirit-land, and in accordance with the custom of the last few years we will give a brief sketch of each.

HARVEY JEWELL.

Harvey Jewell was born at Winchester, N. H., on the 26th May, 1820, and was graduated at Dartmouth College in 1844. Soon after graduating he was induced by the Hon. J. D. Philbrick, then a teacher in the Mayhew School, Boston, to accept a position in that school. After a brief period of successful teaching, Mr. Jewell decided to pursue the study of the law, and in due time became a member of the legal profession, in which by his application and fidelity he became prominent and gained a wide and well-earned reputation as a learned, faithful, and honorable lawyer. Though not without desire for honor and political preferment, he was not willing to sacrifice principle, or stoop to any measures of doubtful propriety, though by so doing he might rise to the highest position in the political world. He was repeatedly a member of the city council, but declined being a candidate for the mayoralty of the city, or for the highest office of the state.

In 1875 Mr. Jewell was honored by President Grant by being appointed one of the judges of the court of Commissioners of the Alabama Claims,—and in this capacity he spent about two years in Washington, faithfully devoting himself to the important trust confided to him and his associates. For eight years he represented the city of Boston in the State Legislature, and for four years he was the presiding officer of the House, performing the duties of the position to very great acceptance.

Mr. Jewell was one of five brothers, and the eldest, we believe, all of whom had within themselves the elements of success in whatever calling they should engage. One of them, Hon. Marshall Jewell, was for two years governor of Connecticut, and subsequently a member of General Grant's Cabinet.

In personal appearance, in his general bearing, and in his entire character, the subject of this notice was no ordinary man. Though engaged in teaching but a brief period, he gave evidence of ability to take a high rank had he made that his vocation. He became a member of the Institute in 1847.

SAMUEL W. BATES.

Samuel W. Bates, who died in the city of Boston on the 13th of January last, was the youngest son of the Rev. Joshua Bates, D. D., for many years president of Middlebury College, Vermont. Having pursued a preparatory course of study at Burr Seminary, Manchester, Vt., he entered Middlebury College, from which he graduated with honor. He soon after was chosen principal of Nichols Academy, in Dudley, Mass. He remained here as a highly successful and acceptable teacher till 1846, when he was elected to the mastership of the Adams School, in Boston. In 1850, much to the regret of the committee and patrons of the school, he resigned that he might pursue a course of study for the law. In their report the committee said: "The resignation of Mr. Bates is a serious loss to the school in which he was eminently successful as an instructor."

For twelve years Mr. Bates was an active and influential member of the School Board of Boston, and in 1853 he wrote a very able and interesting report on the school and educational matters of the time.

Mr. Bates honored himself and the profession of teaching by taking an active part in all efforts for the improvement of schools and awakening a deeper interest, in their work, on the part of teachers. He was one of the earliest and most efficient members of the Massachusetts State Teachers' Association, and one of a committee appointed by that body to establish the *Massachusetts Teacher*. As one of its first managers and editors he was very helpful, — being always ready to do his full share of work.

After several years of successful work in the school-room and community in the line of education, he decided to en-

gage in the practice of the law, and the last twenty-five or thirty years of his life were given to the legal profession, in which he gained and maintained a high rank as a successful practitioner. Mr. Joshua Bates, an elder brother of the deceased, and now living, will be remembered by many as for a long period the very popular principal of the Brimmer School, in Boston, and also as one of the early and active promoters of educational progress.

Mr. Bates, the deceased, became a member of the Institute in 1847. At the age of sixty years he died, having proved successful both as teacher and lawyer.

LEANDER WATERMAN.

Mr. Waterman was born at Halifax, Mass., Sept. 22, 1832. His earlier years were spent in the common schools of his native place, whose advantages at the time were much more limited than now. With a desire to qualify himself for teaching he attended the Normal School at Bridgewater, Mass., and Kimball Union Academy at Lebanon, N. H.

After several terms of experience in the district schools near his birth-place, he went to Baltimore and taught a school of colored children for nearly two years, after which for three years he had charge of a graded school in West Newton, Mass., where his success and reputation were such as to secure him a position in the John A. Andrew School of Boston, where for twelve years he proved a most acceptable teacher, and where he remained until his death, which occurred at Dorchester, Mass., Nov. 19, 1881, at the age of forty-nine years.

Mr. Waterman was a well-qualified, earnest, faithful and conscientious teacher, and the twenty years or more that he devoted to teaching will be felt for good in long years to come by the multitude of youth who came under his instruction and influence.

Mr. Waterman was a patriot as well as an educator, and when our country's liberty was imperiled he gave his services for her rescue and enlisted as a private in the Twenty-fifth Connecticut Regiment. His fidelity and valor soon

took him from the ranks and promoted him to the command of company E, in the regiment in which he enlisted. Mr. Waterman became a member of the Institute in 1860, and was present, with a class of his pupils, to give an exhibition of musical proficiency, at the meeting held in this place (Saratoga) two years ago.

E. FRANK WOOD.

Of those who have achieved success in the teacher's vocation in the last quarter of a century, few have been more meritorious than Mr. Wood. He was born in West Boxford, Mass., Oct. 17, 1832, one month later than Mr. Waterman, the subject of the preceding notice. After enjoying the meagre advantages afforded by the district school in his native town, Mr. Wood availed himself of the superior privileges of Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass., and Putnam Free School, Newburyport, Mass., both being within a few miles of his paternal home. He quite early manifested a desire to engage in teaching, and when nineteen years of age, he taught his first school at Byfield, Mass., with very good results. After this he taught district schools in West Newbury and Amesbury, Mass., and was employed for one year in Burlington College, New Jersey.

In 1855 he took charge of the West School in Milton, Mass., where he remained seven years, doing excellent and well appreciated work. The reputation gained here, and his interest in education, secured for him the very honorable and important position of mastership of the Mather School, Dorchester, Mass., from which, after three years of faithful work, he took the sub-mastership of the Quincy School, in Boston, and after five years of good work he was, on the death of Mr. Valentine in 1870, elected principal, a position of great responsibility and influence, and which he occupied with signal ability until his death, which took place Jan. 16, 1882.

By his education, by his genial manners, by his enthusiasm and zeal in his work, Mr. Wood was peculiarly fitted to enlist the interest and coöperation of all with whom he had anything to do,— and, though he was called away in the very

midst of life and usefulness, the influence he exerted and the work he performed, during thirty years of faithful and intelligent teaching, will prove a perpetuating blessing. Of him his pastor, the Rev. P. B. Davis, thus spoke on the occasion of his funeral:

"To do good as he had opportunity was the spirit and habit of his life, and deep, warm springs of healthful sympathy and love flowed like perennial fountains in his heart. To him, too, it was given to possess distinguishing qualities which are rarely united in one person. He was a man of independent thought; this resulted in opinions and judgments which were preëminently his own. His convictions were clear and his will was strong; hence in purpose and execution he was not easily diverted. His moral sense was keen and quick, and his allegiance to the demands of right and justice were absolutely uncompromising. To these were added sensibilities as acute as a child's, a nature open and responsive in every part to the appeals of suffering, to the claims of friendship, and to the tenderest movements of affection. If in the structure of his mind there was fibre tough as steel, there were also vibrations in his soul whose music was like the melody of a harp. To know him on one side of his nature only, was not to be acquainted with him. The aggregate of his qualities constituted him a man undeviating in his adherence to principle, unfettered in opinion, firm and abiding in friendship, generous in sympathy, and most tender in heart. Religiously he was characterized by a profound reverence for the Word of God, whose truths and promises he unhesitatingly received."

He joined the Institute in 1867.

Two or three facts in relation to Mr. Wood and Mr. Waterman, previously spoken of, seem worthy of notice as remarkable coincidences. They were born in the same year, one in September and the other in October; they both made teaching a life work; both taught in Boston, Mr. Waterman twelve years and Mr. Wood fourteen years;—and as they had been near each other in their most important life-work they were not long separated,—their deaths occurring less than two months apart. It may be added that these two deaths were

the only two that had occurred in the masterships of the Boston schools for fourteen years.

LYMAN COLEMAN, D. D.

On the 12th of April, within the past year, Lyman Coleman, D. D., was called to his rest. He had long been a member of this Association, having joined it in the first decade of its existence.

Dr. Coleman was born in Middlefield, Mass., June 14, 1796, and received his collegiate education at Yale, from which he graduated in 1817. After graduation he taught for three years in Hartford, Conn., and subsequently for four years he was tutor in his alma mater, during which time he pursued the study of theology. In 1828 he was ordained as pastor of the Congregational Church in Belchertown, Mass., where he continued to labor for seven years to great acceptance. Being convinced that the work of instruction was that for which he was best qualified, he left the ministry, and for five years he was principal of Burr Seminary, in Vermont, and then for a like period he was principal of the English department of Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. He took a deep interest in all that pertained to educational work, and was often at public meetings held for the advancement of learning.

In 1842–43 Dr. Coleman spent several months in travel and study in Germany, and on his return to this country he was appointed professor of German in the college of New Jersey. Here, and at Amherst, Mass., and Philadelphia, he spent fourteen years in the performance of different literary work, after which, in 1856, he revisited Europe and traveled extensively in the Holy Land and Egypt, and on returning to his native land he was, in 1861, elected to the professorship of ancient languages in La Fayette College, Pennsylvania, where he remained until his death. It has been said that he was the oldest teacher in Pennsylvania, and it may safely be said that there were but few, if any, older, in active service, in the United States. At the age of eighty-six years he was called from his work on earth and went to the school of the great Teacher.

As Dr. Coleman was a man of commanding appearance and of very genial manners, he readily won the confidence and esteem of all who knew him. While as preacher and teacher he will long be remembered, he will likewise be well known and honored for several valuable additions to our literature and for many useful contributions to our magazines. Of his published volumes the principal were: *The Antiquities of the Christian Church; The Apostolical and Primitive Church; A Historical Geography of the Bible; Ancient Christianity Exemplified; Historical Text-Book and Atlas of Biblical Geography.* Some of these have been republished in England. Of his magazine articles the most prominent and valuable were: *Historical sketch of the Christian Sabbath; Pagan Origin of the Festivals of the Church; Eusebius as an Historian; Review of the Types of Mankind; Palestine and the Desert; Samaritans, a Remnant of the Ten Tribes,* and *The Great Crevasse of the Jordan and the Red Sea.*

From a long, busy and useful life Dr. Coleman, like a shock of corn fully ripe, was garnered for the rewards of a better world. He became a member of the Institute in 1838.

ORVILLE DEWEY, D. D.

The Rev. Dr. Dewey was one of the original members of the Institute, having joined in 1830,—the time of its organization. He was born in Sheffield, Mass., in 1794, and graduated at Williams College in 1814. It is presumed that he devoted some time to teaching, though most of his life was given to ministerial work. At first he was assistant to the Rev. Dr. Channing in Boston for two years. For ten years, from 1823 to 1833, he was pastor of a church in New Bedford, and after that for thirteen years, from 1835 to 1848, he was pastor of a church in the city of New York. At a later period—1858—he became pastor of the New South Church, Boston. Dr. Dewey was an original thinker and vigorous writer, and contributed many able articles for the *North American Review* and the *Christian Examiner.* He died in the city of Boston, early in 1882, at the age of eighty-eight years.

HON. ENSIGN H. KELLOGG.

Mr. Kellogg was born at Sheffield, Mass., in 1812, and graduated at Amherst in 1836, at which time he wrote a colloquy of unusual merit. After graduating he pursued the study of law and was admitted to the Berkshire Bar, but did not long practice in the profession. He soon decided to engage in manufacturing business, for which he was well qualified and in which he was quite successful. Of him the Springfield *Republican* speaks as follows:

"His outside business connections were many; he was president of the Western Massachusetts Fire Insurance Company from 1840 to 1855, vice-president of the Berkshire Savings Bank, and president of the Agricultural National Bank. In town affairs he was influential, a friend of public improvements, president of the recently formed business men's association, a leading member of the First Church parish, one of the projectors of the county historical society, and a member and once president of the agricultural society. He bought the Judge Curtis estate, on which the Kellogg steam-power building has been located, and did much to build up that flourishing part of the town known as 'Morningside.'

"But Mr. Kellogg reached out beyond the life of Pittsfield and Berkshire, and had a share in state and national affairs. He was admirably fitted for public work; but, owing to the attractions of a charming home and a natural indisposition to continue in the strife and turmoil of politics, he scarcely did himself full justice in it. Still, few men in Berkshire have achieved a more honorable record than was his by virtue of acknowledged merit. Like Governor Bullock, Mr. Kellogg joined the Whig party, and won recognition as an earnest, polished and effective speaker; he early became a Republican, and through that party helped to win the battle of freedom. He was sent to the lower branch of the Legislature in 1843, and returned at various times, serving acceptably as speaker in 1850; he was a Senator in 1853, '54 and '77. Mr. Kellogg was a delegate to the Republican convention at Chicago in 1860, which nominated Abraham Lincoln, and was one of the committee that went to Springfield to inform the Illinois lawyer

of the honor which had been conferred upon him. His frequent residence in Boston brought Mr. Kellogg into intimate relations with prominent men throughout the state. His last public service was in sitting as one of the commissioners in the fishery dispute with England. Of late years he has shrunk from public life, and found abundant occupation and satisfaction in his library, and that attention required by his private affairs. He was a man of fine literary taste, and few outside of college professorships acquire so intimate a knowledge of English literature as he possessed."

Mr. Kellogg became a member of the Institute in 1843, and died at his home in Pittsfield in January, 1882, at the age of 70. Greatly respected by all who knew him, his memory will be long cherished as that of a good citizen, neighbor, and friend.

OLIVER CARLTON.

Only a few days before our assembling at this place intelligence of the decease of Mr. Carlton reached us. He was injured by a fall on the 12th of May, from which he suffered until the 21st of June, when the Master called him to his eternal home. It is rarely the case that a man's entire life, from one score to four score years, is so entirely and almost uninterruptedly devoted to the work of instruction as was true in the case of Mr. Carlton.

Oliver Carlton was born in Amherst, N. H., in that part of the town set off as Mount Vernon, July 20, 1801. After enjoying the advantages of the village school and some private instruction in his earlier years, he spent two years at Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass., from which he entered Dartmouth College in 1820, at which he graduated in 1824, being the second in rank in a large class. While a member of college he taught for a season in Northampton, Mass., and at Francestown, N. H. In 1825 he served as tutor at Dartmouth, conducting recitations of a class in all their studies, and at the close of the year was congratulated for the thoroughness of his instruction, as attested by the standard of the class at the closing examination. After this Mr. Carlton taught the academy at Windsor, Vermont, for one

year; at Haverhill Academy, Mass., for three years; at Marblehead, Mass., two years; and at Salem, Mass., as master of the public Latin Grammar School twenty-four years, from 1832 to 1856. From 1857 till 1860 he taught in Portsmouth, N. H., and then returning to Salem he taught a private school nearly ten years, and after that till September, 1881,—a few months only before he met with the fatal accident,—he had charge of private pupils; so that, almost without interruption, he devoted his time and energies to the work of teaching from the age of twenty (while in college) until past the age of eighty, or nearly sixty years. As an instructor Mr. Carlton was accurate and thorough; as a disciplinarian he was firm, uniform, and determined. Mr. Carlton was a man of fine appearance, dignified in manner and bearing, courteous and gentlemanly, always firm and reliable. The hundreds —and thousands, we may say,—of boys who were taught and disciplined by Master Carlton knew perfectly well that attention, order, and thoroughness were of indispensable importance if they would find favor in his eyes, and we doubt not that multitudes who, as school boys, regarded him as at times too exacting, not to say austere, when they became men felt abundant reason for thanking him for the very traits for which, in their younger and less wise days, they had censured him. In all his labors and efforts he had a greater interest in knowing how his pupils would regard him when they should become men, than while they were pupils. The name of Master Carlton, as he was always called, will long be remembered, and his teachings long be felt, in the city in which for nearly two score years he gave instruction.

As evidence of Mr. Carlton's reputation and ability as a scholar, it may be said that for two years, or longer, he was a member of the Board of Examiners for Dartmouth College, and for ten years of that for Harvard. For fifty years, or longer, he was commissioned a justice of the peace for Massachusetts; for several years an officer in the church of which he was a member and superintendent of the Sunday School.

He was greatly interested in educational progress, and when the Massachusetts State Teachers' Association was formed in

1845, he was elected to the presidency. He became a member of the American Institute in 1833.

RALPH WALDO EMERSON, LL. D.

Of all whom Death has taken from our roll of membership during the past year, not one had gained a more extensive and well-merited reputation than Dr. Emerson, who died at his home in Concord, Mass., on the 25th of May, 1882, at the age of seventy-nine years.

Dr. Emerson was born in the city of Boston on the 25th of May, 1803. At the early age of fourteen years he joined the Freshman class in Harvard College, from which he was graduated in 1821, when only eighteen years of age. While a member of college it is said that he manifested an unusual interest in examining and reading the volumes in the college library,— even to the neglect, at times, of the regular college curriculum. For a time after graduating he taught in the school of his brother William, in Boston. On a certain day, while engaged in teaching, Daniel Webster was to deliver a eulogy on the ex-Presidents, Adams and Jefferson — whose deaths, as will be remembered, occurred on the same day. At the close of the school on the preceding day he announced that the school would be closed on the following day, that all might have the privilege of listening to Mr. Webster. One of his pupils, the late R. H. Dana, preferred to spend the day with hook and line, on the banks of streams in the vicinity. On learning this the next day, Mr. Emerson, with great seriousness, said to this pupil, "You have missed a privilege for which you will be sorry as long as you live."

After teaching for a season, Mr. Emerson engaged in preaching in the city of Boston, but after a year or two he left the profession, not having views in full harmony with the creed of the denomination of which he was a member. From this time until the time of his death he devoted himself to literary pursuits. As a writer and author he has gained a world-wide reputation, and his name will go down to posterity as that of one of the most remarkable and intelligent men of his time. Mr. Emerson is too well known as

an author and writer to make any extended notice of him or his works necessary.

He became a member of the Institute in 1833, soon after its organization.

GEORGE C. MERRILL.

Mr. Merrill was born in Montague, Mass., on the 1st of July, 1845, and was educated at Amherst College, Mass., from which he graduated in 1865. After graduating we think he taught in two or three different places and acquired a reputation for teaching that gained him a position in one of the best and most distinguished schools of the country, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass., where for ten years he proved himself a most excellent and acceptable teacher, and where he died in the prime of life and usefulness on the 19th of April, 1882, greatly beloved and respected by all who knew him, the youngest of all whom death has taken from our number the past year, being only thirty-seven years of age. He became a member of the Institute in 1868.

MALCOLM W. TEWKSBURY.

On the 5th of March, only a few weeks before this meeting, Mr. Tewksbury died at his home in Malden, Mass. He was born in Chester, N. H., about the year 1833, and was graduated at Dartmouth College in 1858. After graduating he engaged in teaching, and for several years was principal of the Nashua High School, where he proved a highly successful and acceptable teacher. Mr. Tewksbury was an ardent patriot, and when President Lincoln called for volunteers in our late war, he was among the first to respond. He served during the war in a Wisconsin regiment, in which he was promoted to the office of major.

Soon after the close of the war he was elected to the office of Superintendent of Schools in Fall River, Mass., where he remained until he was invited to become the New England agent of one of the largest publishing houses of New York. Mr. Tewksbury was a man greatly respected by all who knew him, and proved highly successful in every position he

was called to fill. He became a member of the Association in 1869, and at the time of his death he was forty-nine years of age.

SAMUEL H. WHITE

died in Peoria, Ill., on the 9th of March,—only a few days later than Mr. Tewksbury. Mr. White was a graduate of Michigan University, and on graduating, his purpose was to enter the legal profession. While in Chicago for the purpose of locating in his chosen profession, he was tendered the mastership of one of the city schools. From 1856 to 1868 he was the honored principal of the Brown School of Chicago. In 1868 he was invited to take charge of a county Normal school at Peoria, Ill. He accepted the invitation, and in September, 1868, he entered upon the duties of the position, and for eleven years labored with great fidelity, earnestness, and success. His influence in the cause of education was not only felt in the school of which he was principal, but in "all the region round" he was a power in the work of education. He labored earnestly, and with a "zeal that was according to knowledge," for the advancement of his chosen work.

For several years Mr. White was editor of the *Illinois Teacher*, through which his influence was felt throughout and beyond the state limits.

Mr. White was born in Niagara County, New York, Oct. 7, 1830. Though his life was not long if reckoned by years, it was long if measured by the good works he performed and in the good influences exerted by him, and in which "he still lives" to bless and advance the good work to which most of his active life was consecrated. Mr. White became a member of the Institute in 1864.